UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. XII SUMMER, 1960 No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.
The Intentions for the Unity Octave of Prayer

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S. A.
The Mystery of Unity

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.
Personalities of the Council of Florence: VI, George Scholarius

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.
Protestants and the Ecumenical Movement in the United States, II

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
An Important Papal Document Regarding the Second Vatican Council
Archbishop Andreas Sheptytsky and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the Second World War
A Letter of a Faith and Order Commission Member to Pope John XXIII

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR
GARRISON, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

† Hector Cunial
Archiep. tit. Soteropolitan., Vicesgerens

Rome, July 19, 1960.

ROMAE - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE INTENTIONS FOR THE UNITY OCTAVE OF PRAYER

The Octave (or the Week) of Unity, which is observed each year from January 18, feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome, to January 25, feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, has become over the years ever more of a world event. The principal Christian confessions have adopted this practice in which they find an occasion to manifest their regret for the present divisions, their desire of regaining the unity lost, and their firm determination of realizing that which they all recognize as being the will of Jesus Christ: « that they all may be one. »

The World Council of Churches, as well, has made of it one of its ecumenical endeavors.

A very great number of Catholic parishes observe these days of prayer fervently. At Rome, for example, the Octave is celebrated at the Church of Gesù with large numbers of the faithful and in a most solemn manner: with sermons, hymns, and with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament; the ceremony is generally presided over by a Cardinal.

Thus, there is much praying done for unity. But it is precisely here that we have been questioned — and this for some time now with a growing insistence and inquietude — on a problem which we would have deemed simple enough, but which in reality is somewhat complicated: what intentions should characterize the prayer for unity during the days of this very important week? In proposing an answer, we will confine ourselves to the Catholic point of view. We are aware, in fact, that the World Council of Churches is also occupying itself with this question and that a consultation on this subject already took place at Bossey in February.

In order to understand the question and its real difficulty, we must delve into a bit of history. It is well known that the Octave was conceived, proposed, and inaugurated by an Episcopalian minister, Paul Wattson, in 1908. At the time, Father Wattson still believed in the legitimate status of the Anglican Church, but convinced of the necessity of unity, he labored to the end that Church might become one in communion with the successor of the Prince of the Apostles. Moreover, when he conceived of the

idea of a period of prayer for unity, it was his wish that it should take place at a date that would recall the primacy of St. Peter. Accordingly, he chose the eight days that run from the feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome to that of the Conversion of St. Paul. Thus, the two apostles, whose martyrdom rendered illustrious the Eternal City, were commemorated at one and the same time.

The general purpose of this initiative was to pray and to work for the promotion of genuine Catholic unity. As yet there was only one general intention for the prayer of the Octave, but it was quite precise: « The return of all Christians to the Apostolic See. » It is evident that at the outset, Father Wattson counted upon attracting to his movement only those Christians who were, like him, persuaded by the titles of the Church of Rome; and to this conviction he endeavored to lead the entire Church of England.

In 1909 Father Wattson was received into the Catholic Church with the two congregations which he had founded, one of men and the other of women, and which were still few in numbers. As an Anglican he had celebrated the Octave on only two occasions. In 1911 there appeared a list of special intentions for each day of the Octave. That of the first day read: « That all Christians may recognize the Chair of Peter as the divinely established center of unity. » The following year the same intention was differently formulated: « For the return of all the other sheep to the one flock of Peter. » In 1913 Father Wattson proposed the intentions which he was to conserve henceforth without alteration; these were arranged according to differences of doctrine, while the preceding ones had followed more of a geographical pattern. The intentions were formulated thus:

January 18: Feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome: The return of all the « other sheep » to the one fold of St. Peter, the one Shepherd.

January 19: The return of all Oriental Separatists to communion with the Apostolic See.

January 20: The submission of all Anglicans to the authority of the Vicar of Christ.

January 21: That the Lutherans and all other Protestants of Continental Europe may find their way « back to Holy Church. ».

January 22: That all Christians in America may become one in communion with the Chair of Peter.

January 23: The return to the Sacraments of all lapsed Catholics.

January 24: The conversion of the Jews.

January 25: Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul: The missionary conquest of the entire world for Christ.

Even after the death of their founder in 1940, the Fathers of the Atonement have propagated the Unity Octave with practically the very same set of intentions.

These intentions are proposed to Catholics and, as well, to all those who, although not being Catholics, are nevertheless convinced that unity must be realized by communion with the Holy See. They are in fact inspired by the doctrine of unity professed by the Catholic Church: in order to belong to the Church of Christ, one must submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, successor of the one to whom Jesus Christ gave the keys of His kingdom.

For more than twenty years the Octave remained everywhere that which its founder had made it. The practice kept growing apace throughout the Catholic world, and Father Wattson even labored for it to become obligatory. In 1926 Cardinal Bourne, archbishop of Westminster, prayed Father Paul to modify the name of the prayer movement, which up until then had been termed the Church Unity Octave. He judged that it would be more preferable, at least for England, to adopt the title suggested by Mother Lurana, foundress of the Atonement Sisters, namely: the Chair of Unity Octave. Thus, in 1931 Father Paul gave his approval to this modification.

« This name, » he wrote, « is a more explicit description of the kind of Unity we desire and pray for. Outside the Catholic Church every man has his own theory and conception of Unity; the title ' Chair of Unity ' definitely declares that communion with the Chair of Peter is the only infallible and unfailing test of Catholic Unity » [1].

Meanwhile another outstanding apostle of unity began to appear at Lyons — a city that has seen the origin of a number of admirable Catholic enterprises, such as the initiative for the Propagation of the Faith, that of the Holy Childhood, and that of the Eucharistic Congresses, the Prado. Abbé Paul Couturier, a simple college teacher, had been devoting himself since 1923 to the care of Russian refugees, a large number of whom the force of circumstances had led to Lyons; and it was this love for the Russians that induced him in 1932 to visit the Monastery of Amay (later

---

[1] *One Fold* (edited by Edward F. Hanahoe, S. A. and Titus F. Cranny, S. A. Chair of Unity Apostolate, Graymoor, N. Y., 1959), p. 89.

transferred to Chevetogne) which Dom Beauduin had founded to promote the cause of Union. There, as he himself relates, he became imbued with « a lively and unshakeable devotion for the cause of Unity » [2]. Upon his return to Lyons, he set to work to prepare for the Octave of January 1933. At the beginning his activity is limited to Catholic groups. Soon, however, a number of invitations to the Orthodox and to the Anglican monks at Nashdom extend the circle of those praying for unity. In time a new idea presents itself: the prayer for unity is not made only *for* all Christians; it should be made *by* all Christians, as well: « We understand this Octave as the convergence of the prayers of each Christian confession, in full liberty and independence, towards the Christ whom we love, adore, and preach » [3].

Henceforth, not only will Catholics alone be asked to observe the Octave; it will be asked of all Christians. This extension is already a mark of progress. And this progress could not be displeasing to Father Paul Wattson, who recognized it and who, in fact, rejoiced in it. Writing shortly before his death he said: « Once make the Octave's observance universal, not only among Catholics in all parts of the world, but among the 'other sheep' now unhappily cut off from communion with the Apostolic See, and as a result of this universal repetition on the part of the Christian believers of the original prayer of Our Blessed Lord, 'that all His disciples may be one', what else could we expect but a corresponding answer from the Almighty and the speedy fulfilment of Our Lord's own prophecy: 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring and they will hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd' ». (*The Lamp*. January 1940, p. 29). Moreover, Father Paul himself invited to observe the Octave all those « who bear the name of Christ ».

Consequently, the intention of the Octave, having been proposed to all, must necessarily remain more general and no longer require that « all Christians recognize the Chair of Peter as the divinely established center of unity ». How could one propose such a prayer to those who often regard the Pope as antichrist and who from their childhood have heard others around them repeat « no papacy » or « Los von Rom »? As Fr. Maurice Villain has put it: « Everything is asked in view of loyalty; in the matter

---

[2] Maurice Villain, *L'Abbé Paul Couturier, Apôtre de l'Unité chrétienne*, Ed. Casterman: Paris, 1957, p. 143.

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

of prayer for unity, it cannot be asked of anyone to make concessions with regard to his own faith »[4]. The only thing that could be asked of all is to pray for unity, leaving each one free to add those clarifications dictated by his faith. As can be seen from the text cited previously, Father Wattson saw the expression of this in the very formula of Christ: « that all may be one ».

In another general intention the Abbé Couturier asks nothing further than « the unity of Christians, such as Christ has willed it for His Church ». At the most, in the expression « such as ... etc. » one would suppose a lack of awareness which, for Catholics, could not be entire.

But for those who « would desire a particular intention for each day » Abbé Couturier suggested two schemes which were almost identical, except that one of them — that which was ultimately retained — made mention of the Jews. This scheme reads as follows:

January 18 - The unity of all Christians
January 19 - The sanctification of Catholics
January 20 - The sanctification of the Orthodox
January 21 - The sanctification of Anglicans
January 22 - The sanctification of all Protestants
January 23 - The sanctification of the Jews
January 24 - The sanctification of non-Christians
January 25 - The unity of all men in the charity and the truth of Christ

These intentions have nothing about them that is properly Catholic. Not only do they differ from those which were proposed at first; but over the course of the years they have given the impression of being in opposition with the first intentions; and they have been judged as such by many. It is precisely there that lies the problem which I should like to examine.

I shall do this with full liberty. However, let me say at the outset that I should not wish to lessen in the minds of any the admiration which the zeal and the work of the Abbé Couturier have merited. This humble priest profoundly felt within himself the evil of the division of Christians, and he dedicated himself to the problem with body and soul, with an intense and industrious charity. He presented to non-Catholics the genuine countenance of the Church. His spirit of complete abnegation in order to promote Christian unity made of him a congenial example and leader. If I must defend a point of view which perhaps escaped

---

[4] Ibid., p. 50.

him, I can repeat with him: « Nothing could be more unfortunate than new disputes and new separations with regard to prayers for Christian Unity » [5].

Considered in themselves, the intentions promoted by the Abbé Couturier are excellent. To pray for the sanctification of the different Christian communities, of Jews, and of other non-Christian groups — what could be more laudable? However, we must regard them within their context, that is to say, within the Octave where they have inserted themselves after the intentions which they have replaced, and taking into account the interpretations which they have received. The Abbé Couturier is no longer present in order to explain them or to correct them.

No difficulty arises when these intentions are proposed to non-Catholics. To the latter, as we have said, we cannot present the formulas of Father Wattson, which implicate the desire of communion with the bishop of Rome.

Everything changes, however, if the end or at least the result of the intentions proposed is to bring Catholics to ask for unity without the precise character that belongs to the Catholic faith. Still more serious would be the danger if by this lack of precision the faithful are led to dream of a unity which is as yet unknown, to be realized in a future more or less distant by reciprocal sacrifices of almost equal amplitude.

According to the Catholic faith, dogma is unchangeable. It may undergo development, but always in the same sense. Even in the most distant future, every Catholic will profess that the Pope of Rome, when speaking « ex cathedra », is infallible; that the Virgin Mary was conceived without original sin and that after her earthly life she was taken body and soul into heaven; that tradition is a source of revelation; and many other verities which are denied at the present time by Protestants. If one supposes that unity will one day be realized — that veritable unity in one same faith, one same worship, and one same government — then one must understand by this that all Christians will then confess to everyone of these verities. To ask for unity is for a Catholic to ask that all Christians accept the Catholic faith. If you tell a Catholic to pray for Christian unity, you are telling him to pray that the Orthodox and Protestants become Catholics. This is what Father Wattson did, and this is what very many others continue to do. But it is just this that those who propose Abbé Couturier's formula wish to avoid. And in doing so, they proffer

---

[5] Ibid., p. 64.

two reasons in particular: prayer, they say, will be more efficacious if it is the same made by all Christians at the same time; and, moreover, it is to be feared that our separated brethren will refuse to pray with us if we pray that they will become Catholics.

Actually, the first reason given is quite weak. Doubtless, one may believe that prayer for unity will be more acceptable before God if it is made by all Christians, and that it will be more easily universal and more fervent if it is made by all at the same time. Yet it suffices for this to have the general intention which every Christian can and should accept — that of praying for unity after the imitation of Christ and in union with Him. In any case, each one understands unity according to his own confession, in such a way that as long as they remain divided Christians cannot really all make the same prayer. Some Protestants of high authority, indeed, recognize this: « As long as in our prayers for unity », writes Dr. Oscar Cullmann, « we are thinking of the *manner* of realizing the unity of the Church, we are no longer praying for the same thing ... If Catholics pray, as believing Catholics, for the unity of the Church, they must necessarily pray for our submission to Rome. If we pray for unity as we conceive it, we must pray that Catholics cease to be exclusive in the Catholic sense — in other words, that they cease to be Roman Catholics » [6].

Dr. Cullmann even explains that Catholics are more limited by their faith than are Protestants: « Catholics themselves », he declares, « will not have to hide from us Protestants that they *cannot* discuss unity with us with that absence of a priori principles of which we can give proof when we engage in an ecumenical dialogue. In virtue of their faith in the Church, they are obliged to be exclusive in this regard, while our faith in the Church does not hinder us from recognizing other Churches as such » [7].

The directives for the Week of Prayer in 1959 issued by the Commission on Faith and Order, presided over by the Anglican Bishop, the Reverend Oliver Tomkins, made clear the impossibility of a prayer for unity which could be the same for all Christians. In the preface to the Commission's prayer leaflet for that year, one reads that « the more Christians come to know one other, the more conscious they become of their differences ». And even more strongly: « For Christian prayer is realistic. The contradictions which we see in the present observances of prayer for unity only

---

[6] Oscar Cullmann, *Catholiques et Protestants — un projet de solidarité chrétienne*: Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959, p. 39.

[7] Ibid., p. 25.

reflect the real state of division in the Church of Christ. Our prayer for Christian unity must be able to comprehend the actual situation which we are facing. If our prayer avoided or ignored the reality of our tragic condition, it would not be true prayer ».

« Nevertheless », concludes the Commission in its leaflet for the Week of Prayer for 1960, « there is on all sides a growing conviction that the unity of the Church of Christ is God's will and that He is working to bring it about. That is why, despite the different ideas of unity, which lie behind them, it is fruitful to offer up all of our various prayers for Christian unity together at one time: we all know that God hears and answers the prayers of all according to His own will and plan ».

One will say: But why not abstract from the differences by putting them in parentheses and think only of the simple will of Christ, with everyone united in the single prayer of Christ? To this I would answer: the will and the prayer of Christ on this point are not undetermined; they are without abstraction and without parentheses; they require unity within the Church founded by Jesus Christ. Every Catholic knows what that Church is. If he does not pray that all Christians may belong to the Catholic Church, he is simply not praying according to the will of Christ.

This is so true that when Catholics, out of an intention of pure charity, agree to pass over this doctrine in silence, certain Protestants think that they have relinquished it. Let one example suffice. Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, in a sermon preached at the Church of St. Peter in Geneva on January 17, 1960, declared: « We rejoice that so many of our Catholic brethren have come to understand that the only adequate prayer for unity is that which asks of God to show us His way towards unity and have renounced the practice of directly or indirectly asking God to deign to resolve the problem according to our ideas or our preconceived notions ». That the way towards unity is the way of Rome is not a preconceived notion which one might renounce — this is Catholic doctrine. Let, then, all Christians pray for unity; and let them do so at the same time to manifest their will for union; but that each pray according to his belief.

There is another reason alleged for proposing to Catholics the intentions which we are discussing: if we ask for their return to the Catholic Church, our separated brethren will refuse to pray with us. It seems, in fact, that certain French Protestants have threatened to do this. Yet I must admit that I cannot comprehend this difficulty. No one is demanding that Protestants unite themselves to the prayer of Catholics who pray in their capacity as

Catholics. There is nothing to prevent the former from asking for unity in their own way, even though aware that Catholics are asking for it in a manner that differs from theirs.

In the Catholic conception, the word *return*, which in any case can be avoided, does not denote anything that could be termed offensive. It often appears in documents of the Holy See — even in the most recent ones [8]. It possesses an historical sense relating to the past when members of the Catholic Church separated themselves from the other members and founded the Protestant confessions; if, therefore, present-day Protestants were to enter the Catholic Church, they *would be returning* to that body which the founders of the Reformation left. This does not at all suppose that the Protestants of our day are to blame. Neither do we wish to say that the Catholic Church has undergone no changes in the meantime; however, those which have come about, as well as those which are yet to come, do not affect it substantially, in such a way that it is indeed to that same Church which they left that Protestants today would be returning if they were to become Catholics; and it is that same Church to which they would be coming back in the future. It is a myth to suppose that all the churches are in the same situation with respect to unity and that one day they are going to find themselves united without any one of them having to modify its doctrine. Either unity will never be realized, or else the non-Catholic churches will become Catholic. The changes which can reasonably be expected on the part of the Catholic Church are too accidental, and in reality they could be effected even today without that Church losing anything of its proper character.

Since such is the Catholic faith, non-Catholics, and particularly Protestants, should understand why we ask for unity in the way we do. Even those Catholics who make use of formulas which are less explicit know very well that in the measure in which they pray for unity they are asking that it be realized within the compass of their Church.

Indeed, how does the World Council of Churches comport itself in this regard — and especially its Commission on Faith and Order which is particularly taken up with this question? At Evanston this Commission declared that it was promoting the

---

[8] The word 'return' is found in the encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram*: « ... permit Us to nourish that hope for your return, which We foster with sentiments of paternal love ». (Cf. *Unitas*, vol. XI, p. 205). This sense is also to be found in Pope John's *Motu Proprio* for Pentecost of this year: « ... ad unicam Christi veniant Ecclesiam ».

practice of the Week of Prayer from the 18th to the 25th of January (or at another date where this would be more convenient). The reason given for this was an excellent one: « We cannot expect God to give us unity unless we prepare ourselves to receive His gift by costly and purifying prayer »[9]. Each year the Commission publishes a kind of guide for the « Week of Prayer for Christian Unity ». Its intentions are different from those which are ordinarily proposed to Catholics. But the more general intention is to pray for unity, with the desire being that all Christians pray at the same time.

In 1958 the Commission's publication presented a commentary on the *Our Father;* in 1959 it recommended the virtues of unity: love, joy, peace, patience, goodness, fidelity, amiability, and temperance. In 1960 the general intention was given as the unity of the local parish within the unity of the universal Church, based on a commentary on 1 Cor. 27-28.

The Reverend H. Waddams, formerly secretary of the Church of England's committee on foreign relations, was instrumental about two years ago in bringing together a commission to examine the formulation of the intentions. The conclusion arrived at by this body was simply to dedicate the days of the Week of Prayer to the different confessions. Thus, for example:

1st day: All Christians
2nd day: Catholics
3rd day: Anglicans
4th day: The Orthodox, etc.

Each confession remained free to consider the communion indicated for each day and to pray for it with respect to unity in the manner which seemed best. Certainly, there is nothing to object to in this manner of procedure.

* * *

We may terminate our study at this point; in our opinion it justifies the following conclusions:

It is fitting that all Christians should feel keenly the present state of division, that they should wish it to cease, and that they should unite themselves to the prayer of Christ for unity.

It is desirable that they should all pray at the same time each year; they will thus be manifesting their desire for union and will

---

[9] G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity.* Fourth Series, 1948-1957; Oxford University Press, New York, 1958, p. 240.

be preparing themselves to receive the graces which will lead to unity.

All Christians can pray in general for genuine unity, which is that which Christ wills.

Let Catholics hold it as a truth of faith that their Church is the only true Church of Christ and that consequently unity is possible only by the acceptance of her teaching and of her authority on the part of other Christians. When they pray for unity, they are therefore praying that other Christians enter the Roman Catholic Church. The intentions proposed by Father Wattson simply apply to those different groups of Christians in accordance with that teaching. One could do the same thing by making use of other expressions. For example, Catholics could employ the following formulas:

January 18: For the union of all Christians in the true faith and in the Church.

January 19: For the reconciliation of separated Eastern Christians with the Holy See.

January 20: For the reconciliation of Anglicans with the Holy See.

January 21: The reconciliation of European Protestants with the Holy See.

January 22: That American Christians become one in union with the Chair of Peter.

January 23: For the restoration of lapsed Catholics to the sacramental life of the Church.

January 24: That the Jewish people come into their inheritance in Jesus Christ.

January 25: The missionary extension of Christ's kingdom throughout the world.

The particular intentions formulated by the Abbé Couturier have the disadvantage of not asking for unity directly; they might lead one to believe that Catholics are hesitant about their tenets, and that unity coul be attained otherwise than by the entrance of other Christians into the Church of Rome.

For any reasonable motive and in particular if Catholics and non-Catholics are to draw up common programs, one may very well — with reciprocal respect for differing doctrinal positions — either content himself with the general intention without assigning a day to the different confessions; or else simply name the confessions, leaving to each the task of determining in his prayer what to request for this or that confession in view of unity.

These few pages will perhaps prove to be displeasing to some whose friendship I value highly. I pray them, however, to give careful thought to the reasons I have stated. My belief is that the ecumenical effort will attain its goal only if Catholics follow out literally the prescription made in the *Instruction* of the Holy See on the ecumenical movement: « The whole and entire body of Catholic doctrine is therefore to be proposed and explained. Nothing embraced in Catholic truth must be passed over in silence or cloaked under ambiguous language, especially as regards the true nature and means of justification, the constitution of the Church, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction, and the only real union effectuated by a return of the dissidents to the one true Church of Christ ».

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

THE MYSTERY OF UNITY

During these perilous times in which we live, there is much talk of peace and unity. The two are tied together, because peace is the fruit of unity. A secure and lasting peace will take place only when there shall be a true and lasting unity among men. And this unity will come at the time when men are at one with God. It was the mission of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to establish this unity between man and God and between man and man. He came as a Reconciler and Peacemaker. His chief instrument for establishing peace and unity among men is His Kingdom on earth, His Holy Church. It will be of much profit to all who are concerned with the problem to study His Church and her unity.

Our Lord, in the course of His earthly life, gradually introduced the minds of men to His plan for unity. The first of His public acts was that of announcing the kingdom of God. In describing this kingdom, He used various parables like the laborers in the vineyard, the sower and his seed, the net cast into the sea, the mustard seed, and many others. This Kingdom, as He described it, was to be a social reality which was the earthly preparation for the eternal kingdom of heaven. And in the parables one or other feature of this kingdom was brought out.

Now, there is one parable which particularly merits our attention, for it brings out, in a striking manner, the mystery of unity. « The kingdom of heaven », Christ said, « is like a king who made a marriage feast for his Son. And he sent his servants to call those who were invited to the marriage feast, but they would not come ... Then He said to his servant, ' The marriage feast indeed is ready, but those who were invited were not worthy: go therefore to the crossroads, and invite to the marriage feast whomever you shall find '. And his servants went out into the roads and gathered all whom they found, both good and bad; and the marriage feast was filled with guests. Now the king went in to see the guests, and he saw there a man who had not on a wedding garment. And he said to him, ' Friend, how didst thou come in here without a wedding garment? ' But he was speechless. Then the king said to the attendants, ' Bind his hands and his feet and cast him forth into the darkness outside, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth '. For many are called, but few are chosen ». (Matt. 22:1-14).

This parable should provide much matter for reflection to thoughtful minds. What is the marriage feast to which the parable refers? In the parable the King is, obviously, God the Father, and the Son is Jesus Christ. The marriage in question is the mystery of the Incarnation — the ineffable union between the divine and human natures in Christ. The Eternal Son of God assumed a human nature in the womb of our most Blessed Lady. This union took place at the very instant when Our Lady consented to the divine message of the angel, « Be it done unto me according to thy word ». « And the word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us ».

We are told that, « The kingdom of heaven is *like* a king who made a marriage feast for His Son ». So, the kingdom is not the marriage itself, but something *like* it. The Incarnation is a sort of wedding of a Divine Person and a Human Nature — Jesus Christ, true God and true Man. But a kingdom is a society. What is it that is here? It means that the Society which Our Lord was about to establish would involve a certain participation in this mystery of the Incarnation. It means that, in the plans of God, all men were to be invited to become members of a very special kind of society — a society in which they would become united to God and to each other — a Society which would, in some way, reflect the mystery of the Incarnation itself.

One important feature of this society is the fact that it is composed of people living in this world. The reason we say that is the fact the parable describes the crowd filling the banquet hall as the result of a free acceptance of a divine invitation and the fact that the composition of the crowd takes in both good and bad persons. Our Lord, evidently, is not talking of the eternal abode of the saints, because He speaks of good and bad people mingling together in the kingdom; it must be some society here on earth. This thought is found in other parables, as well. For example, the wise and foolish virgins who await the Bridegroom, the wheat and tares that grow together in the kingdom until the time of the harvest, the net cast into the sea holding good and bad fish which are separated on the shore. In this parable we get the picture that the good and bad mingle together, but when the King puts in His appearance at the time of Judgment, a separation is made. Those wearing the wedding garment of sanctifying grace share the banquet of eternal glory; those without this garment are cast into the darkness outside.

This is a partial description of the Church founded by Christ; a very special king of society, existing in this world, which shares in and reflects, in some manner, the mystery of the Incarnation,

and into which all men are invited to enter. Let us try to fill in some more details. We shall let St. Paul be our guide.

St. Paul declares that Christ, « is the head of his body, the Church ... For it has pleased God the Father that in Him all His fullness should dwell and that through Him He should reconcile to Himself all things, whether on earth or in the heavens, making peace through the blood of His Cross ». (Col. 1:18, 19-20) « ... and him he gave as head over all the Church, which indeed is his body, the completion of him who fills all with all ». (Eph. 2:22-23).

We can easily see that the Apostle is speaking of the same reality that Our Lord described in His parable. The Church is, in some way, the completion of the Incarnation, because it is the Body of which Christ is the Head. St. Paul teaches that through the Blood of His Cross, Our Lord achieved the reconciliation of man with God; He made it possible for men to share in the life of God and so enter heaven. But in order that men down the ages of time should participate in these fruits of the redemption, Our Lord established His Church. Through the Church men are brought into contact with the mystery of the Cross and share in the fruits of the Redemption. The Church is a channel of divine life; in the Church we are reborn as children of God; in the Church we are reconciled to God should we fall; in the Church we are fed the divine Food of the Eucharist; in the Church we are strengthened by the Holy Spirit; in the Church we are taught by God's own teachers; through the Church we enter into life eternal.

The Church, then, is very different from every other society in the world. It is a Divine Society in which God and man are united. There are some who say that the Church puts itself in between man and God. This arises from a misunderstanding. For the Church itself is Christ — Head and Body; He is the Head and we are the members, and the Holy Spirit is its soul. Note carefully these words of St. Paul: « For as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, many as they are, form one body, so also is it with Christ. For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body ... Now you are the body of Christ, member for member ». (1 Cor. 12:12-13, 27).

There is a very interesting point that St. Paul makes here that we may not have caught in the first reading; let us consider his words again: « For as the body is one and has many members ... so also it is with Christ ... Now you are the body of Christ, member for member ». He is speaking of the Church and addressing the members of the Church, and yet he says, « so also is it with Christ », when we would expect him to say, « so also is it with the Church ». In St. Paul's mind, Christ and the Church

made up, as it were, one thing; he named the body by naming the Head, so close is the bond of union between Christ and His Body, the Church.

It should be clear by now that one of most noteworthy attributes of the Church founded by Christ is unity — a divinely-given unity. We say a divinely-given unity because, although the Church appears before the eyes of men as a human society, the bond which unites it is not simply the result of a common agreement of the members, though they freely persevere in it. No. The unity is not to be attributed to merely human strength, but to the Divine Power which sustains it. « I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world ». « The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it ». Men may freely separate themselves from this unity, but they cannot divide it into scattered and separated parts.

We can form some idea of this divinely-given stable unity if we study Our Lord's priestly prayer at the Last Supper. « Yet, not for these only do I pray but for those who through their word are to believe in me, that all may be one, even as thou, Father, in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory that thou hast given me, I have given to them, that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them and thou in me; that they may be perfected in unity, and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast loved them even as thou hast loved me ». (John 17:20-23).

Who is there to say that the Son of God who raised the dead and commanded the winds and the sea could utter a prayer that was inefficacious? — a prayer for something that was a specific vindication of His divine mission. On one occasion, He cured a paralytic by an act of will as a sign of His power to forgive sin; now He points to the unity of His Church as a sign of His divine mission: « That the world may believe that thou hast sent me ». This was twice repeated at the most solemn hour of His life, and it was pronounced without condition or reservation of any kind. Our Lord does not say that there will be no sinners in His Church; He does not say that the frailties and human limitations of those who represent Him will not hamper its work. In His parable of the marriage feast, He declares explicitly that good and bad will mingle together in the banquet hall. Unity is therefore a divine gift, not a purely human achievement.

The unity of the Church manifests itself chiefly in two ways; unity in the profession of one divine faith and unity of visible social bonds. By the unity of faith we mean what St. Paul meant

when he said: « Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all say the same thing; and that there be no dissensions among you, but that you be perfectly united in one mind and in one judgment ». (I Cor 1:10) « ... careful to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: one body and one Spirit, even as you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and throughout all, and in us all ». (Eph. 4:3-6).

By unity of social bonds, we mean not only that there are people found everywhere who profess this one and the same divine faith, but that they form one and the same Society throughout the world. Very frequently in the New Testament we read of the necessity of obedience to the divinely established order in the Church and of charity among the members. St. Paul speaks to the new Christians thus: « Therefore, you are no longer now strangers and foreigners, but you are citizens with the saints and members of God's household: you are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets with Christ Jesus Himself as the chief corner stone. In him the whole structure is closely fitted together and grows into a temple holy in the Lord; in him you too are being built together into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit ». (Eph. 2:19-22) It should be clear, then, that the Church, great as it is, forms one Society — that same society of which the apostles themselves were the first members.

This unity of the Church is likewise dynamic. That is to say, the membership may grow in quality and in quantity. St. Paul speaks of the « building up of the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the deep knowledge of the Son of God, to perfect manhood, to the mature measure of the fullness of Christ ... For in him the whole body ... derives its increase to the building up of itself in love ». (Eph. 4:12-13, 16) The Church, while ever remaining the same in its nature, can be said to grow insofar as the membership can increase in an ever deepening knowledge of the faith and grow constantly in holiness and charity, deriving all its power from Christ the Head.

The unity of the Church also grows in quantity through the never-ending influx of new members. The servants, as we recall, were sent out by the king to the crossroads to invite all they found to come to the marriage feast. This is, in fact, what Our Lord Himself did when He commanded His apostles: « All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with

you all days, even unto the consummation of the world ». (Matt. 28:18-20) « But they went forth and preached everywhere, while the Lord worked with them and confirmed the preaching by the signs that followed ». (Mark 16:20).

In the designs of Our Lord, the unity of the Church is to constantly extend itself until it encompasses the whole inhabited earth. « And other sheep I have that are not of this fold. Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd ». (John 10:16) Note the words, « this fold »; the unity of the one fold exists from the beginning, but it is to constantly grow by incorporating those who are not yet of it, until the day comes when the whole world will acknowledge the one shepherd and become members of His one fold. Men are to be brought into unity by being reconciled to God and sharing His divine life in the body of Christ, the Church.

One final observation. Deep in the hearts of men today is a restlessness and dissatisfaction. Though they may not be able to define it clearly to themselves, what they are really desiring is the unity which Christ's Church offers. This dissatisfaction may hold a threat of disaster or it may hold a promise of peace. We must pray, then, that the minds of men will turn in the right direction, that they may yearn for the unity of the one fold of Christ. To them we address the words of St. John: « What we have seen and heard we announce to you, in order that you may also have fellowship with us, and that our fellowship may be with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ ». (I John 1:3).

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S. A.

PERSONALITIES OF THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE

VI. George Scholarius [1].

How many men of the name of George Scholarius were there involved in the controversies of the Council of Florence — one, two or three? The extremely learned Leo Allatius at the beginning of the seventeenth century was convinced that there were three; John Caryophilus, nearly as learned as Allatius and a contemporary of his, decided for two. Nowadays no one seriously upholds that there was ever more than one. The reason for this wide divergence of opinion is that during the Council a Scholarius spoke and wrote openly and forcefully in favour of union, and after the Council a Scholarius was the very leader of the anti-unionists, who by his action and writing did more that any other single person, with the exception of Mark Eugenicus perhaps, to defeat the union. It was, however, the same Scholarius, whose real name was George Courtesis, the title 'Scholarius', which he himself later used exclusively and by which he is now known, being rather the designation of a profession.

George Courtesis was born in Constantinople about the year 1405 from parents of medium station who had came from Thessaly to settle in the capital. He began his studies under Mark Eugenicus, but was self-taught as regards the humanities, philosophy and theology. He early learnt Latin, and, as his preferences were for philosophy and theology, he turned to the great Latin theologians, particularly to St. Thomas Aquinas. Of the Greek philosophers he was a disciple of Aristotle rather than of Plato, not so much because he was opposed to Platonism as because he found in Aristotelianism a better ally of religion. His admiration for Latin theology and particularly for St. Thomas was, then, the greater, because there he found Aristotle's philosophy not only made to subserve the faith, but purified and improved in the process. In a letter to the Despot Constantine of about the year 1433,

---

[1] This article leans heavily on the scholarship of the late Fr. Martin Jugie, A. A., who had an unparelleled knowledge of the writings of Scholarius.

after dismissing the philosophical learning of his Greek contemporaries as almost elementary, he continued: « So I applied myself to the most ancient masters and their writings, reading not those most easy to grasp ... but the most learned and the most profound who have penetrated to the core and marrow to provide nourishment both for themselves and others, namely Theophrastes, Alexander, Porphyry, Syricius, Simplicius. I did not stop even at these great names, but, thanks to my knowledge of Latin, suspecting that foreign learning (I mean that of the Latins) would be of great help for the attainment of my purpose, I perused many Latin works, many of the early period, a few of the middle period, very many of the most recent period where there is more rigour and accuracy. In fact the Latin masters knew not only Porphyry, Alexander, Ammonius, Simplicius and Themistius, but they had made for themselves translations of the writings of Averroes and Avicenna and of many other Arabs and Persians. I read those translations also. Everybody, I suppose, knows that Averroes is the best of the commentators on Aristotle and that, beside being a commentator, he was the author of many works worthy of serious study. The Latins, utilising these various sources of information, made many a discovery for themselves. They have in consequence added many improvements to Aristotle's philosophy. By questions and reflections of a high order, by distinctions of great subtlety, they have surpassed the explanations of our first commentators. Nay more, they have even managed to surpass themselves, and the later ones among them bear away the palm from their predecessors ».

Scholarius more than once contrasted the vigorous philosophical thought of the West with the stagnation in Constantinople, where, he said, there were not more than three or four, not merely ready to study philosophy, but even capable of it. That defect he set out to remedy and to restore to the Greeks what had once been a chief Greek glory. He opened, therefore, a school to teach grammar and philosophy, where he commented on Aristotle, beginning with logic and the art of dialectics. For the sake of his pupils he translated in this period of his life several of St. Thomas's commentaries on Aristotle, and in his own commentaries and explanations he followed the Thomistic method — clear exposition of the question, difficulties, proof, answer to difficulties. It is, perhaps, small wonder, also since Latins frequented his school, that he began to be regarded as too friendly to Latinism and to be suspected of being even infected with Latin errors. To answer his calumniators he wrote a short discourse wherein he mingled attack and defence: the philosopher in Greece is rare and unappreciated,

while Italians in numbers come to Constantinople to gain what Greeks neglect; recognition of Latin learning is not the same thing as accepting Latin dogmas (from which charge Scholarius vigorously defends himself), though his accusers are probably ignorant of what Latins teach; in any case no one can say what he holds on disputed questions, because he has never disclosed his mind on them. Suspicion, however, did not dim his appreciation of western thought, for some ten years later, when he was already launched on his anti-unionistic career, he translated for one of his favourite pupils St. Thomas's *De ente et essentia,* in his introduction to which he wrote: « I doubt if Thomas has any more fervent disciple than me. The man who once has attached himself to him will have no need of any other Muse, and if he manages thoroughly to understand him, he can think himself happy indeed ... Thomas is without any question the chief of all [Latin teachers]. That is why he has received the approbation of the Roman Church, whereas the others are honoured only in the schools ».

While Scholarius was engaged in these activities of teaching, writing and translating, he gained the friendship of the Emperor, John VIII, and without relinquishing his teaching was made imperial secretary and Judge General of the Greeks, and (though still a layman) the regular preacher to the court, who every Friday evening addressed « the Senate and all the city » in the imperial palace. It was the period when Constantinople was in close diplomatic contact with the Pope and the Council of Basel over the question of union of the Churches. Scholarius' opinion was sought on the advisability of going to Italy. He was wholly in favour, provided that the discussion there of the differences that divided the Churches was frank and thorough; if the aim was only a union of expediency, an arrangement between a few ambassadors would be as good and less laborious and less costly. He was not certain (as appears from a letter to a nephew) of a happy outcome of the Council, but that he was optimistic about it is clear from a letter of his dating from this period to Pope Eugenius. There, after referring to some previous communication of his and a papal answer, he tells the Pope « as common father and shepherd of the universe » of his desire to see and venerate « the chair of Peter and you his successor » and conveys his good wishes for what the Pope has so much at heart, namely the Council. Whether Eugenius replied also to this letter too is not known, though it is very likely that he did.

Scholarius journeyed to Italy for the Council as an adviser of the Emperor, but he went after the main party. He was not

elected one of the six Greek orators to speak during the doctrinal sessions, and, even more surprising, he was nominated to hardly any of the many official Greek committees that were formed. Indeed his name barely appears at all in any of the sources of the history of the Council. That means, at least, that he took no great part in the rifts and squabbles among the Greeks that Syropoulus describes in such detail, and that he was on the whole less active either for or against union than many others. Syropoulus, that anti-union apologist, is suspiciously silent about Scholarius, which is almost enough in itself to show that he was not anti-unionist. The little we know about his activity in Italy is as follows.

In Ferrara he was consulted on the choice of subject for the first doctrinal debates, whether it should be the 'illegality' of the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed, or the doctrine of the *Filioque,* and he agreed with Bessarion (and his own principles enunciated in Constantinople) that the doctrine should be discussed as being fundamental. He himself claims to have written the discourse that Bessarion delivered in two sessions of early November 1438 in answer to Andrew of Rhodes. When the Council was to move from Florence, he wrote to Ambrogio Traversari, begging shelter in a little corner of his monastery on the outskirts of Florence, pleading in excuse his late illness.

In Florence the public sessions on the *Filioque* ended on 24 March 1439. For several weeks there was stalemate. In mid-April first Bessarion, then Scholarius, addressed the Greek synod to persuade the prelates that as the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, were inspired by the same Holy Spirit, their doctrine must agree. Scholarius exhorted, challenged, almost insulted his audience. He was obviously in a state of high nervous tension, probably because news had lately come from Constantinople of an impending Turkish attack on the city. This discourse of his is usually entitled: *On the Need of helping Constantinople,* but that is the theme of only part of it. The gist of his words was as follows. The Greeks, knowing little of the learning and skill in dialectics of the Latins, had come to Italy thinking that they would easily vanquish them in argument. Instead they had found that the Latins had not only ably defended themselves but had brought forward the most famous of the Fathers, Greek as well as Latin, in support of their faith. The Greeks had no reply to make, because the Fathers cannot contradict each other; if any one of them seemed out of harmony with the rest, the one should be explained so as to agree with the many. Greek and Latin Fathers agree. The saints we may not deny, or say that they are mutually op-

posed — that would upset the whole of the faith; while to assert that the Latins had falsified them is the height of stupidity (a hit at Mark Eugenicus). The Latins had already reconciled certain apparent differences of the Doctors, but if doubt remained he (Scholarius) would do it in a couple of hours. So let there be an end to words. The Latins had proved their orthodoxy. The Greeks could now unite with honour, and should do so, and get help for Constantinople. The Barbarian feared nothing so much as their union with the Latins: their wives, families, were looking to them. The Latins erred in no point of the faith. So let them unite, get ships, return to Constantinople. Any other course would be shame to themselves and treachery to their people.

Both Bessarion's more measured exposition and Scholarius' more impassioned exhortation must have helped to break down the prejudice against the Latins in their hearer's minds, but they did not by any means remove it entirely. At the end of April there was still a deadlock in affairs, when the Latins transmitted to the Greeks a formal exposition of trinitarian faith, which the Greeks could not bring themselves to accept. Scholarius composed a similar Greek statement on the basis of texts suggested by Isidore of Kiev, a statement designed to be ambiguous. Even Mark of Ephesus, later on, likened it to an actor's boot so shaped as to go on either foot. Needless to say, the Latins rejected it. The Latin statement was finally accepted after a series of Greek meetings when the Emperor enjoined on everyone to give his opinion in writing.

Scholarius, too, produced his written statement. Indeed, according to the anonymous *Description* of the Council, he was the first to read his aloud in public. It was a concise, unambiguous, and precisely-worded acknowledgement that the Council then siting was oecumenical and that the Latin doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Spirit was orthodox. « I declare that I submit myself to the decision of this our Council, rather of this present Oecumenical Council, and welcome and honour with the greatest veneration and gladness whatever decision it shall make both about union itself and about the kind of union, and I regard that decision as emanating not from men but from God ... Wherefore I consent to this opinion or proposition: The Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son, or from the Father through the Son, as from one principle and one cause, and I assert that this is most true and I say that in this way the inevitable agreement of the Western saints with the Eastern is attained and that anything else would make agreement impossible ».

In the beginning of this same public statement Scholarius

reminded his hearers that he had already made known his views about the *Filioque* in the exhortation he had addressed to them in April, and he then mentioned two other tractates « composed earlier » and now produced for their perusal. How long earlier? He does not say. It might have been only by a few weeks, in the interval from mid-April; but the title of the first of them immediately takes the mind back to the advice he gave in Constantinople in about 1436, and one wonders whether these tractates « composed earlier » may not be works written in Constantinople disclosing the long-held opinions of their author. For the titles under which these tractates go are: (1) On the Character of Religious Peace, that it should be a Dogmatic Union and not a Peace of Expediency; the Solving of the Difficulties that impede such a Peace: (2) The Factors that will make for such a Peace. Scholarius himself summed up their content in these words: « I advised you not even to take into consideration the method of expediency that some have in view, but I declared that it was essential to effect a true union and community of doctrine, which I said was to accept a single opinion about the questions in dispute and to profess this also in the symbol of the faith, either by adding or by taking away according as the grace of God should indicate. Further, the reason for which some are disturbed and pessimistic about this union I showed to be utterly weak and reasonably to conduce to anything but hindering you from union. Then I added the factors that make for it without dilating on them but for the most part just mentioning them, and these are, in a word, the union of the Holy Scriptures and the Teachers of the Church ».

George Scholarius with George Gemistus accompanied the Despot Demetrius when he left Florence on 25 June, and so was not present at the promulgation of the union, whose decree in any case, as a layman, he could not have signed. Writing later, he said that, when he arrived in Venice, he found already there Greeks « not a few, some on private business, others because they could not bear to witness the disaster » [i. e. of union achieved]: he does not say in which category he would have put himself.

Returned to Constantinople with the rest on 1 February 1440, Scholarius took up again his old way of life, still acting as secretary to the Emperor, still Judge General of the Greeks and preacher at the imperial court, and still carrying on his school of philosophy. The Council in Italy that had united the Churches had split the Eastern Church into rival factions of unionists and anti-unionists, the new Patriarch Metrophanes trying his best despite the passivity of the Emperor to promote the union, Mark Eugenicus with

voice and pen directing a determined opposition. Scholarius remained neutral. At the request of Gregory, the imperial confessor, he showed the frailty of some of Eugenicus' arguments in the *Syllogisms against the Latins,* but that was more an exercise in logic than a manifestation of opinion. Mark Eugenicus wrote him a challenging letter, bidding him come off the fence of neutrality on the side of (Mark's) orthodoxy. Scholarius replied telling him, in effect, to mind his own business; but the friendship between them was not broken, for in 1443 Scholarius sent him an affectionate letter to accompany the gift of his essay *Against Pletho.* Mark saw in George his ideal successor for the leadership of the opposition to the union. On his deathbed (23 June 1445) he appealed to him, as the only one capable of the task, to undertake it, and Scholarius yielded, promising unfailing hostility to the union, a promise he ever afterwards faithfully kept.

He was soon to show his mettle. On the occasion of the presence of the papal legation in Constantinople in 1444-5 the Emperor allowed public discussion on the trinitarian question. In fifteen meetings Lapacci, bishop of Cortone, spoke for the Latins, Scholarius for the Greeks, and each side, of course, afterwards claimed to have discomforted the other. Scholarius reproduced his arguments shortly after in a big treatise, of which he sent a rehash to the Emperor of Trebizond at the imperial request. But he was still a bit timid in his new rôle, for he tried to keep both of these volumes from a more general circulation, though a couple of years afterwards he followed them up with a *Dialogue on the Procession of the Holy Spirit,* which certainly was meant for public consumption.

As long as John VIII was alive, Scholarius' position was assured, even though there was for a time some little estrangement between them over his stepping into Eugenicus' shoes as arch-anti-unionist. But when the Emperor died (31 October 1448), with him « all my fortunes died too ». Scholarius' name was mixed up with the faction (and probably correctly) that refused to acknowledge Constantine's coronation till he had declared himself for their view of orthodoxy. So Scholarius retired from public life and in 1450 fulfilled what he said had long been his desire. He became a monk and took the name of Gennadius. Somewhere about this time Lapacci was again in Constantinople and again there were public discussions, in which both the Latin bishop and Scholarius claimed the victory.

Scholarius may really have wished to withdraw altogether from affairs to devote himself to prayer as a hermit. What happened was that, whether forced by circumstances or from sheer

inability to keep himself out of things, he became actually more than ever the very centre and core of the opposition to union, the willingly accepted dictator of the little group of ecclesiastics, calling itself the 'synaxis', which kept up an implacable resistance. He wrote letters, issued instructions, published manifestoes, each one ending with 'for the future I will be silent'. But the last thing he intended was to be silent. As he wrote to Demetrius of Mistra: « And the excuse for the letter was a defence of the supposed silence; yet when was I ever silent in the preceding period? ». He tried to gain the support of the powerful Luke Notaras with letters of abiect flattery, in the style of the time. When the Bohemian Platris accepted Orthodoxy, Scholarius had been his instructor and signed the document that the new convert carried back with him to his Church, last after the 'synaxis': « The universal teacher of the Church of the orthodox, the humble monk Gennadius ». He sent ten chapters of argument to the Emperor Constantine. After the arrival of Isidore of Kiev as papal Legate (26 October 1452), on 1 November he retired to his cell — retired from all mundane strife — but he affixed to its door for all to read a notice beginning: « O miserable citizens, you have ruined everything, and now you abandon your religion », and continuing in the same challenging and inflammatory strain. When Constantine summoned the anti-unionist 'synaxis' to discuss with Isidore the ecclesiastical situation, Gennadius wrote to them that he would not come if it were a question of merely approving what the people had already foolishly accepted; but if there were any new proposal put forward, they should not do anything without his presence and consent. He went all the same to that meeting and to several others, and his presence helped to strengthen the anti-unionist resistance. But despite his efforts, the union was proclaimed from the pulpit of St. Sophia's. Just before that Gennadius shot his last bolt, a circular distributed « in the palaces, in the markets, and in all the monasteries of the city ». He challenged anyone to find any evil in his life; his only 'crime' was fidelity to the faith; faith was free and he would remain united with their holy Fathers; he had the well-being of his fellows at heart; « if then, because I take no part in such a union and because I preserved my faith, which is the ancestral faith, uncontaminated by the heterodox and those who communicate with them, and because I do not alter ancestral ways under stress of emergency and because I keep silence, you should wish to do and say whatever you like, I have already not only committed to God the things about which I have before now spoken, written and counselled (without, however, convincing you), but also I will with

joy undergo the ordeal in witness to the ancestral faith and orthodox doctrine, even indeed death itself, to the glory of God ». After this and the promulgation of the union (12 December) Gennadius shut himself up in his cell, where he remained till the Turks took the city. He was led off, a captive, to Adrianople.

His captivity did not last long. Some leading Greeks who remained free persuaded Mahomet that the best way of restoring order was to enlist the aid of the Church, and they suggested Gennadius as its head. Gennadius' owner learnt who he was, and took him back to Constantinople. In the autumn of 1453, having been given back his old monastery, he tried to gather together the old community of monks, buying some out of the captivity and seeking out others who had remained free. It brought him little joy of heart, for of «the monks, who even before [the capture of the city] used to fill everything with malice and disorder, now, making the disaster to the Christian name an excuse for avarice and for the satisfaction of their passions, filled full the former holy order with disorder, the souls of the beholders with scandal, and the world with every evil ». He was elected patriarch against his will by a synod of bishops, and on 6 January 1454 enthroned, not however in the church of St. Sophia, for that was now a mosque, but in that of the Holy Apostles. The Sultan bestowed the insignia of office as once the Christian emperors had done. He wrote an encyclical letter to try to bring back the old regularity of life and to hearten the faithful to constancy. Mahomet, who through the restoration of the patriarchate had harnessed the Christian Church to the Mohammedan State, three times visited Gennadius to talk about religion, and as a result the Patriarch, always grateful for the tolerance shown to the Church, composed a short outline of the faith for translation into Turkish. Any hopes he may have had of the Sultan's conversion were vain. But he would not brook paganism from any other source. He violently attacked Gemistus's book *About the Laws,* burning all but a few fragments of the only copy that existed, because it advocated a kind of neo-Platonic naturalism to replace Christianity.

Gennadius was isolated in his endeavours. Cliques were formed against him; accusations and menaces followed. Laymen and even clerics embraced, or threatened to embrace, Islam if their greed were checked. He was not made of the stuff to bear contradiction and failure. He set his mind on retiring, but had to remain in office for some time longer. He served for a full year, perhaps two, before he was allowed to seek the quiet of Mt Athos. Sadness followed him there in the death of his nephew whom he loved as a son. He moved on to the monastery of

St John the Baptist near Seres (Macedonia). There he spent the rest of his life, except for two more short reigns as Patriarch (not of his choice, but by order of the Sultan), the one probably in 1463 which he ended by flight, the other not long after, which lasted about a year and a half. His leisure in the monastery he passed copying his old works and writing new ones, works on the Scriptures, on philosophy, on theology, which included a return to his old love, for he made a résumé of St Thomas's *Summa contra gentiles* and of the *Prima* and *Prima secundae* of the *Summa theologica* (in all 663 pages of large octavo in the modern edition). He died some time after 1472.

* * *

The above account has been written on the supposition that there was only one George Scholarius, the subject of all the experiences recorded. There is no doubt that the George who before 1437 was imperial secretary and Judge General, went to Italy, in Florence composed the Greek statement on the Procession of the Holy Spirit (April/May 1439) and after his return to Constantinople continued as imperial secretary and Judge General and besides took over from the dying Ephesus the direction of the anti-unionist movement — for all these facts there is abundant documentary evidence. What has been called in question is whether that George was the author in Florence of the exhortation to the Greek synod, of the treatises in favour of union, and of the precisely-worded statement accepting the Latin doctrine. No one now seriously doubts that these two Georges were one and the same, but it is perhaps still worth while giving a few positive reasons for that acceptance, besides the negative one that there is no indication whatever to the contrary (apart from the change of religious front implied), for these treatises had always been attributed to the imperial secretary George till Leo Allatius, nearly two centuries after the Council, could not credit that one man could have defended two such opposite opinions.

But surely it was *a priori* likely that a man as steeped in Latin thought and as well disposed to the Latin Pope as was Scholarius would have accepted the orthodoxy of Latin doctrine. More than that. He had in his explanation of the preposition « Through » in his *First Introduction to Grammar* (written about the year 1430) insisted that « Through » implied a real, though intermediary, causality subordinated to a principal cause. This reasoning, if applied to the causality in the Trinity, leads precisely to the conclusion of the Council of Florence, namely that the

Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father as principal cause, through the Son as the mediating cause that has its power of causality from the principal cause. The pronouncements of Scholarius, therefore, at Florence involved no break with the past, though after the Council he changed his explanation of «Through» in his *Grammar*, limiting it to material causality.

But the pronouncements of the Scholarius of Florence do not harmonise with the writings of the Judge General and the Gennadius of the years that followed Florence — except for his *Refutation of the Syllogisms of Mark Eugenicus*. There are, however, in those writings admissions of a change of view and of a less 'orthodox' past. Replying in 1440 to Mark Eugenicus who had reproached him for his disloyalty (apparently for a second time) to Mark's type of orthodoxy: « We were filled with grief and desolation, when we heard that you had again turned round and were thinking and saying the opposite », Scholarius wrote: « I have often hitherto repented of much of what I have said on various occasions, from which I know that I have been the cause of good to no one and of scandal to not a few, who taking up my words and understanding them, each after his own fashion, thought that I too had a variable opinion about things divine ... They could not distinguish between 'economy' [i. e. adapting one's conduct to circumstances] and rigour and the fit times for each of these, and so they blamed those who could ... » — that is, a recognition that there was at least some foundation for what Mark had said, but that it had its excuse in Scholarius' suiting his behaviour to the times, and this from the man who in Constantinople before the Council had deprecated anything but the greatest sincerity in discussion and decision.

Several other times, too, the polemical Scholarius in veiled language admitted his 'fault'. For example, in his panegyric on the dead Eugenicus he said: « But now, having at last come to our senses, we grieve for our past sins either of silence when that was not proper or of speech when silence was due. »; and, writing after 1448, he declared: « But not even those of US as survive, are not bound to be slaves for ever to the things in which WE OURselves are conscious of having sinned ».

Once at least in unveiled language — and once is enough, even if there were no other indication to support its assertion — Scholarius says plainly that he had upheld Latin orthodoxy in both speech and writing. The statement comes in a criticism of Bessarion's *Dogmatic Oration* of April 1439, written probably shortly before he finally decided to throw in his lot with the anti-unionists. Of that criticism only a long fragment survives, but

that fragment contains these words: « I found then that the western Doctors were right in their assertion [of the *Filioque*] and that some of ours supported them; and since it was impossible that the Doctors of the Church should be proved false, I concluded from that that there was no case for rejecting the communion of the Latins, seeing that they believed and professed a true doctrine ... That, then, is why in all simplicity and from the bottom of my heart I was reconcilied with the Latins and constantly made the weight of my arm felt by those who unsparingly abused them. I undertook the defence of their faith in more than one treatise, and I cleared them of a quantity of absurdities that those who had written lengthy books against them fastened on them — or rather on the Doctors of the Church. In consequence, I was called a 'Latiniser' by some ... And doubtless, while I condemned the ignorance of such folk, perhaps on the spur of the moment I said things like a Latin and, as happens in such circumstances, gave the impression in the heat of the squabble of being too indulgent towards the Latins and too hard on my adversaries. So I was then considered to be completely devoted to Latinism and to be contemptuous of and openly hostile to our traditions ». Scholarius is here letting us in behind the scenes and offering information that even Syropoulus refrained from giving. But the time that Syropoulus was writing his *Memoirs,* Scholarius, if he was not already the head of the anti-unionists, was their hope for the future and, in either case, his reputation was to be preserved.

It can hardly be doubted, then, that Scholarius-Gennadius first of all and over a long time upheld the orthodoxy of the Latin doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, even though he regretted the introduction of the *Filioque* clause into the Creed, and then in many a polemical writing defended the Photian position, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father only. One naturally asks why; but it is easier to ask than to answer. One reason may have been a sense of national pride, not to seem to betray the honour of the Greek Church which since the time of Photius had held, against the Latins, that the Spirit was from the Father only. Another reason may have been a kind of thwarted ambition or wounded pride. Scholarius was an outstanding scholar. His writings include works on philosophy, theology, grammar, philology, history, poetry, sermons, panegyrics, as well as translations. He was a deep thinker, versed in both Greek and Latin theology, pre-eminent among his contemporaries. He himself could not help but be aware of this excellence; he seems to

have been too conscious of it, so that he resented it if anyone else laid a claim to scholarship.

In his letter to Mark Eugenicus already quoted he mentioned: « I suppose that no one is unaware that for rhetoric, philosophy and the highest science of all, theology, I learnt from none of our teachers ... And now how much am I not better than all others in learning? »; and elsewhere: « In respect of sacred theology, which all my life through has had the greatest interest and profit for me, no one at all of the men now living anywhere knows as much as I do ». Of the three or four contemporaries in Constantinople whom he will acknowledge to have some claim to scholarship (i. e. including himself), the majority (consequently all except himself) « are content with seeming, instead of being » scholarly. He attacked Gemistus with religious zeal for his neo-paganism, but it was a personal motive that made him belittle the older man's learning. In the sad days after the fall of his city his mind went back to the applause that had fed his soul before: « How can I recall without tears my audience of that day, the Emperor, his brothers, the courtiers, the bishops, the ecclesiastics, the monks, men from the markets, the citizens, foreigners, to whom I used to proclaim the word of God as they sat before me in the imperial hall ... Separately one lauded this excellence of those homilies, another that ... but all extolled the dexterity in words that God had given me ... Oh! the daily discussions, sometimes in the presence of the Emperor himself, sometimes without him, one putting forward one difficulty, another, and all, as if in the theatre, anxious to hear the one man who would give a solution to all. Oh! the good will, the honour, that was paid me by every one, and the joy with which they awaited us, thinking the day that we were not to be found in the palace a day of mourning, and when we came on the next day, embracing us as if we had returned from a long journey ... » But after the Council of Florence it was not Scholarius, but Bessarion who, it seemed, had the limelight, for he was made a cardinal; and the contrast rankled. In his comments on Bessarion's *Dogmatic Oration* Scholarius blamed his one-time friend for not having sought his advice and help in composing the oration, and, after lamenting the broken friendship, wrote: « But now he adds brilliance to Italy, but we pass our days among citizens worthy indeed but, with very few exceptions, uneducated and with no love for letters [2], with no possibility of displaying any of our talents to such as them and attaining thereby some glory and favour ».

---

[2] Reading *anerastois* for the *anerastoi* of the text.

If Pope Eugenius had offered Scholarius some honour, like the red hat, would the issue have been different? In the event it was Eugenicus, who doubtless long ago had noted both the strength and the weakness in Scholarius' character, who made the right psychological approach, by appealing to him as the only one capable of the task he wished to entrust to him: « I have known him since his youth and have looked on him as my son ... I believe that he alone of all men of this time can give the helping hand to right doctrine, buffeted by the storms of violence from those who have corrupted the perfection of doctrine, so as with God's help to set the Church right. ... Seeing then that I must shortly depart this life and finding no one besides him capable of filling my place for the defence of the Church, the faith and the doctrines of orthodoxy, therefore I appeal to him ... » Scholarius accepted the charge, promised to devote himself to the defence of what Eugenicus held so dear, and ever afterwards was faithful to his word.

But even his devotion to the orthodoxy of Eugenicus could not make him as abusive in his polemics as were some of his fellows. Though he claimed complete certainty for his views (« There is no fear whatsoever that I elect anything but the best or that I fall short of the truth in my quest of it » — from the introduction to his first *Treatise on the Procession of the Holy Spirit*); even inspiration from on high (« Established by divine providence in the ranks of those able to defend the faith »); and revelation in a dream (« The Lord knows, all this I heard recounted to me in a dream as I was then in that dismal city » — note at the end of his *On the Distinction between the Divine Persons*), still he never characterised the Latins as heretics, but was content to refer to them as schismatics, or heterodox, or separated. This, unusual, mildness in controversy came doubtless from his respect for Latin theology and the fact that he was never so certain of his viewpoint as to feel quite free from the danger of mistake. He held his opinion, he said, till another council (Florence, he rejected) should settle the matter, to whose decision he would submit himself whether it harmonised with his own teaching or not. Meantime — play for safety: « Hence it is extremely dangerous to make additions. Be satisfied with what from of old has been professed in the Church at large ». Dangerous, not absolutely fatal: so the Churches should be kept sundered on a probability.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

PROTESTANTS AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, II

American Protestants, from very early in the history of the United States, were aware of their many divisions, and a number of earnest church leaders set to work with characteristic energy to remedy the situation. An excellent summary of these efforts during the nineteenth century has been described by Donald Herbert Yoder in *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* [14]. In general, the work for unity centered in the heroic attempts of a handful of zealous men who stimulated the whole movement rather than achieved success in it.

Thomas Campbell (1763-1854) and his son, Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), provided an impulse to unity which is peculiarly American. The movement which was begun by the Campbells had particular appeal on the American frontier for its simplicity. Its message was to « push through the tangled underbrush of the Protestant creeds, which are for the most part human opinions only, to the pure spring of Bible truth. Unite in Christian Associations, rejecting human creeds and rallying around the Bible alone » [15]. The Campbells' plan for the promotion of unity was to go back to the primitive church and to unite on fundamentals taught only by the Bible. Several movements similar to this program for unity arose in different parts of the United States. What was new in these efforts was the attempt to bring about unity through the restoration of primitive Christianity. As Yoder remarks, however, « It is one of the ironies of history that all these movements, starting on the premise of restoring the unity of a divided Christendom, crystallized into denominations » [16].

Another ecumenical plan of the nineteenth century came from Samuel Simon Schmucker (1799-1873) a German American Lutheran. His scheme for Christian union envisioned the formation of a foundation he called, « The Apostolic Protestant Church ». The member churches were to accept a creed based on the doctrines

---

[14] Op. cit., Chapter 5, « Christian Unity in Nineteenth-Century America », p. 221-259

[15] Yoder, op. cit., p. 237.

[16] Op. cit., p. 241.

which were common to all Protestant denominations and which was therefore considered basic. The individual churches were to retain their own way of worship, their ministry and discipline, and their own larger creeds. Schmucker's united church was thus in reality a federation of churches. His Apostolic Protestant Church never came into being and he was for the most part rejected by his own people. Yet his ideas had some fruition. In 1846 the Evangelical Alliance was formed; in 1867 the American Branch of the Alliance was founded; and in 1908 the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America came into being.

The most influential Episcopalian ecumenist of the nineteenth century was William Reed Huntington (1838-1918). At first Huntington tried to achieve unity by inviting all denominations to join the Episcopal Church which would then be called the « Catholic Church of America ». As a basis for unity he set forth a minimum list of the essentials of Anglicanism: 1. The Holy Scriptures as the Word of God; 2. The primitive creeds as the rule of faith; 3. The two sacraments ordained by Christ; 4. The historic episcopate as the keystone of governmental unity. This platform, which was later called the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, was adopted in a slightly modified form by the Lambeth Conference in 1888.

Huntington's first proposal for unity met with no success and therefore he tried again. This time he put forth a plan for a national American church which would do away with denominational superstructures and merge presbyteries, synods, and conferences. However, each individual church was to retain its own system of worship in this scheme and all varieties of Christians would be able to use the same local building. The plan never materialized, but it was a new and daring proposition that had a subsequent echo in the so-called Greenwich Plan of organic union offered by Charles Clayton Morrison in 1949.

The efforts of the Campbells, Schmucker, and Huntington are representative of a number of American projects for denominational unity during the nineteenth century. All the ecumenical attempts may be reduced to three basic approaches: 1. An attempt to achieve unity by simplifying the church and restoring its primitive or Gospel state; 2. The formation of a federal union of churches; 3. The amalgamation of denominations on the basis of certain essential elements.

All three plans are still to be found in twentieth century America. However, the first or « Bible » plan has adherents almost exclusively among the fundamentalists. There are no Pretestants in the United States who do not revere the Bible, but a literal interpretation of the Scriptures is seen to be more and more

impossible in the light of advanced Biblical theology and therefore any scheme for unity based on such an interpretation becomes less and less tenable.

The second plan for union among the denominations, namely the comprehension of diverse traditions within a federation of churches, has been called the « typically American approach » [17] and it has had a good deal of success. In 1908, 28 denominations formed the cooperating agency known as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The year 1941 saw 15 fundamentalist bodies establish the American Council of Christian Churches. Finally, in 1950 the largest American interdenominational federation of churches, called the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, came into being through the merger of the following eight interdenominational bodies:

1. Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America
2. Foreign Missions Conference of North America
3. Home Missions Council of North America
4. International Council of Religious Education
5. The Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada
6. National Protestant Council on Higher Education
7. United Council of Church Women
8. United Stewardship Council.

After the foundation of the National Council four additional agencies have merged with it: Church World Service, Inc., Interseminary Movement, Protestant Film Commission, and the Protestant Radio Commission.

The National Council is not a church but an agency of its member churches [18] each of which retains its own autonomy, creed,

---

[17] « Christian Unity in North America », J. Robert Nelson, op. cit., p. 22.

[18] Member churches:

American Baptist Convention
National Baptist Convention of America
National Baptist Convention, U. S. A., Inc.
Seventh Day Baptist General Conference
Church of the Brethren
Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ), International Convention
Armenian Church of North America, Diocese
Greek Archdiocese of North and South America
Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America
Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America
Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church

worship, and organization. However, the Council has its own organization. The governing body of the Council is a General Assembly which is made up of approximately 600 delegates officially named by the co-operating denominations. The Assembly meets every two years. Between these meetings a General Board of about 120 official representatives, also designated by the member denominations, exercises supervision over policies, programs, and activities. The National Council functions through four major divisions: Christian Education, Christian Life and Work, Home Missions, and Foreign Missions. Each of these departments is responsible for interdenominational concerns. Besides the greater divisions, there are also ten central departments which provide common services on matters such as: Public Relations, Research and Survey, Broadcasting and Films, Field Administration, Publications, and Finance. There are in addition approximately 875 city and county Councils of Churches, 1,720 Councils of Church Women, and 2,000 local Ministers' Associations which provide channels of local co-operation among the churches and which are closely associated with the National Council.

The third approach to unity is by way of merger. Since 1900 a number of denominations have amalgamated and plans for new unions are constantly set forth. The following are completed mergers.

Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church
Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America
Evangelical United Brethren Church
Five Years Meeting of Friends
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends
Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church
American Evangelical Lutheran Church
United Lutheran Church in America
African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
The Methodist Church
Evangelical Unity of Czech Moravian Brethren in N. A.
Moravian Church in America (Unitas Fratrum)
Polish National Catholic Church of America
Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
The United Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.
Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America
Hungarian Reformed Church in America
Reformed Church in America
United Church of Christ

Year	*Merging Denominations*	*Present Name*
1906	Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. Cumberland Presbyterian Church	Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
1911	Northern Baptist Convention Free Baptist	American Baptist Convention
1918	Hague Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran	Evangelical Lutheran Synod
1918	General Synod of Evangelical Lutheran General Council of Evangelical Lutheran	United Lutheran Church
1922	Evangelical Association United Evangelical	Evangelical Church
1924	Reformed Church in the U.S. Hungarian Reformed Church	Reformed Church in the U.S.
1924	Congregational Church Evangelical Protestant Church	Congregational Church
1931	Congregational Church Christian Churches	Congregational-Christian Church
1931	Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio Lutheran Synod of Buffalo Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa	American Lutheran Church
1934	Evangelical Synod Reformed Church	Evangelical Reformed Church
1939	Methodist Episcopal Church Methodist Episcopal Church, South Methodist Protestant Church	Methodist Church
1946	United Brethren Evangelical Church	Evangelical United Brethren
1957	Evangelical and Reformed Church Congregational Christian Church	United Church of Christ
1958	United Presbyterian Church Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

As may be seen from the list above, the merger of two or more denominations has been a process, for the most part, of simply healing old divisions. The groups involved solved their differences and reunited. Where the merging denominations were not part of an original parent body, they came at least from the same common background and had many elements in common. In many cases union brought some loss of doctrinal content to the combining bodies. This was a natural result because where there are differences of doctrine agreement is achieved by eliminating the divisive elements. Yet such unifications should not be considered as having no value. If they continue to come about, as the many plans on foot now promise, one may be hopeful for even further progress. At the very least, we can say that the direction of Protestantism into ever-increasing denominations has been reversed. This is surely a good sign.

Both the organization of churches into various councils and the mergers of denominations into organic unions are part of the Ecumenical Movement as it exists in the United States. These help to show the character of the Movement, its direction, and in some way its deficiencies. Yet councils and mergers are only a partial picture. To get a clearer view one must see something of the contributions of Americans to the Ecumenical Movement as a whole and in particular it is necessary to review the North American Conference on Faith and Order held in Oberlin, Ohio, from September 3-10, 1957.

In 1954 the Faith and Order Commission at the World Council of Churches Meeting in Evanston, Illinois, U. S., recommended that regional agencies study Christian unity within the framework of local conditions and factors. The United States Conference for the World Council of Churches quickly responded. On January 12, 1955 its Executive Committee voted to hold a conference on the subject of « The Nature of the Unity We Seek ». Matters of arrangement were put into the hands of a committee which immediately invited the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. and the Canadian Council of Churches to share in sponsoring the proposed conference. Everyone concerned readily agreed that the basic method and objective of the conference should be the *study* of problems involved in Christian unity.

Work began immediately. Various departments of the co-perating councils planned their programs to point toward the general aim of the Faith and Order Study Conference. Key religious magazines ran special issues or a series of articles bearing on the major theme. The three theological commissions which are part of the Faith and Order Department of the World Council (and a fourth commission as well which was constituted in 1956) entered

into the work. Christian leaders from many denominations and different regions were asked to suggest areas of « consensus and conflict » in regard to unity and the church.

In September, 1955, the Committee on Arrangements approved a list of 18 screened and sifted topics to serve as a preliminary agenda for studies. After wide consultation, 16 cities of diverse size and type were selected where leaders were chosen to serve as chairmen of study groups. The groups were made up of ten to twenty individuals who came from diverse denominations and included men and women, theologians, pastors, and laymen.

By January, 1956, topics were assigned to each of the sixteen special study groups. The study teams were urged to relate their work to the general theme and to the biblical and theological grounds for all Christian thought and action. They were further told to examine the various forces at work in typical church life in their own city and to offer solutions for the problems faced by the churches. Besides these « official » study groups, approximately 350 other groups involving thousands of people also participated in various studies.

By August, 1956, the sixteen regional committees had made such progress that a meeting was called to discuss the peculiar opportunities and difficulties which each group faced. Out of the experience gained by this meeting, twelve topics were appointed for the twelve sections (divided into three divisions) which were to meet at the Faith and Order Conference. Finally, each study group was assigned to complete a working paper specifically designed for a section of the Conference.

At last, on September 3, 1957, the Meeting opened at Oberlin College in Oberlin, Ohio. Each day the proceedings were opened with morning prayers and closed with evening prayers presided over by representatives of different denominations. Everyone participated in Bible Study and the conferees then broke up into various section meetings, where the basic work of the conference was done. Each evening a plenary session took place at which addresses were delivered by eminent churchmen on the subjects being studied by the four theological commissions of the World Council's Commission on Faith and Order (Christ and the Church, Tradition and the Traditions, Institutionalism, and Worship). The plenary sessions also accepted the reports of the three divisions of the Conference and these were then transmitted to the churches for information and study.

274 official delegates attended the Oberlin Conference from 39 Christian bodies (29 U. S. Protestant, 5 Canadian Protestant, 5 Orthodox). There were 92 consultants, 36 accredited observers

from about 30 more denominations, 2 unofficial Catholic observers, and a number of observers from evangelical churches which have no connection with the World Council of Churches, such as the Southern Baptist Convention and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The topics studied by the Conference were:

General Theme: The Nature of the Unity We Seek

Division I - In Faithfulness to the Eternal Gospel

Section 1. Imperatives and Motivations
Section 2. Doctrinal Consensus and Conflict
Section 3. Baptism into Christ
Section 4. The Table of the Lord

Division II - In Terms of Organizational Structures

Section 5. The life of the Congregation
Section 6. The Work of State and Local Councils
Section 7. Authority and Freedom in Church Government
Section 8. The Variations in Denominational Polities

Division III - In view of Cultural Pressures

Section 9. The Mobility of the Population
Section 10. Governmental Policies and Programs
Section 11. Forces at Work on the College Campus
Section 12. Racial and Economic Stratification [19].

Before coming to the results of the Conference, it is important to note that the Oberlin meeting was characterized by a tremendous thoroughness of preparation. The conferees were all well aware of the issues that would be discussed at the meeting long before it opened. Moreover, the work which was put into the Conference by all concerned and their frank discussions showed how seriously the problem of disunity was considered. Finally, the meeting represented cooperative efforts from a wide variety of denominations. The participants represented virtually every shade of belief in the United States and Canada. The Conference without doubt was a clear exhibition of the Ecumenical Movement at work in the United States.

What did Oberlin achieve? The two unofficial Catholic observers, Fr. Gustave Weigel, S. J. and Fr. John Sheerin, C. S. P.,

---

[19] *The Nature of the Unity We Seek* (Official Report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order), edited by Paul S. Minear, (St. Louis: The Bethany Press), p. 145.

reported that little concrete progress was made at the meeting [20]. Norman V. Hope from the Princeton Theological Seminary in his review of the report of the Oberlin Conference agrees. The Conference issued an official « Message to the Christian Churches » which declared that the unity we seek is a unity: in Christ, in adoration of God, of declared faith and of mutual bearing of burdens and sharing of joys, in which every ministry is a ministry of and for all members, in mission to the world, possessing rich variety in worship, life, and organization. « This statement of glittering generalities », says Hope, « has little that is distinctive about it: it only repeats what has frequently been said before » [21].

Oberlin did, however, achieve something. Hope claims that the real achievement of the Conference lies in the discussions of its twelve groups.

> These groups analyzed with perceptiveness, clarity, and frankness all the major factors and forces which still keep Christian Churches apart in North America; and by setting these sources of division in the light of the urgent imperative of the Christian Gospel to unity among the followers of Christ, Oberlin perhaps opened the way for a more fruitful and constructive approach to these problems. ... In a word, if Oberlin's concrete achievements were meager, its promise is considerable [22].

Paul S. Minear, editor of the official report of the Conference, adds a bit more. He declares that the Study Conference at Oberlin had several features which are new to Faith and Order Conferences:

1. The study of the ecumenical significance of local and state councils, ...
2. The study of the life of local congregations, of prevalent lay ecclesiologies, of the issues which prevent unity in mission, ...
3. The study of those barriers to ecumenicity which alienate denominations which normally cooperate with one another ...
4. The exploration of the distance in actual working faith between laymen of the various churches ...
5. The co-operation of expert sociologists and theologians to examine ... concrete social phenomena ...

---

20 « Faith and Order at Oberlin », *America*, October 19, 1957; « The Sin and Agony of Disunity », *Catholic World*, November, 1957.

11 *Theology Today*, April, 1959, p. 117.

22 Ibid.

6. The full participation of youth ...

7. The teamwork between the ecumenical forces of the United States and Canada, ...

8. The opening up of Faith and Order activity to large circles of churchmen, ... [23].

The above items were considered worth listing not only because they help to place the Faith and Order Conference at Oberlin in better perspective, but also and especially because they help to indicate some prominent American elements of the Ecumenical Movement. Throughout this paper a number of characteristics of this Movement have been pointed out. It will be useful here both as a summary and as an evaluation to describe what this writer considers are the outstanding characteristics of the Ecumenical Movement in the United States.

There is no doubt that the most eminent note is a deeply felt concern over Christian unity. All the factors of American Protestantism contribute in some way: the widespread and numerically large denominationalism is constantly before the eyes of Protestant ecumenical leaders; the social activism of Protestantism spurs people on energetically to try for a solution to their problems of disunity; a changed status for Protestantism from being the most powerful religious force to being simply one of the powerful religious elements in American life also urges Protestants to set their own house in order. With characteristic zeal and energy, they have tried to achieve some semblance of unity. They have formed federal, state, and local councils of churches. They have accomplished a number of mergers resulting in organic unions. They have contributed much to the world movements of Faith and Order, Life and Work, the World Missionary Council, and the World Council of Churches. In a special way American Protestants have shown their concern for unity in the Study Conference of Faith and Order held at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1957.

Along with the concern for Christian unity, however, the American Ecumenical Movement shows certain curious factors. These are difficult for the Catholic to understand. Perhaps they are endemic to Protestantism and therefore the problem of the Ecumenical Movement may be reduced to that of Protestantism itself. In any case, for all of the many words spent on the need for religious unity, there is a singular lack of definition. Just what *is* the unity the Protestants are seeking? The nature of that unity was the theme of the Conference at Oberlin. One might expect something definite coming from a meeting of such proportions: the

---

[23] Op. cit., p. 19.

best minds and the best energies of American Protestantism working directly on the problem of making precise what they are looking for. Norman V. Hope's comment that the message of the Conference contains only « glittering generalities » has already been quoted. George L. Hunt, in his excellent *Guide to Christian Unity* [24], examines various factors and forces in belief, church organization, and society that make for unity and disunity. He then admits that nowhere has he defined unity. Why? « If we have failed », Hunt declares, « to give a definitive answer to the question, it is because this guide has attempted to reflect the situation in the church today on this issue. Rather than propose that unity take a specific form, the author has done what the conference at Oberlin did — pose the issues, and leave it to churchmen and the churches to find their own way of obedience to Christ's call for unity in his church » [25]. It seems clear, then, that the Ecumenical Movement is moving ahead by moving sideways; progress is more accidental than controlled because no one can put his finger on just where he wishes to go.

One may say, of course, in a quasi-defence of the lack of a definition of unity, that the Ecumenical Movement is developing its doctrine on religious unity bit by bit. This is true. There has been a growth in the understanding of what is unity and what is disunity. If one were to try, however, to get a statement on the present position of Protestantism in the unity which is sought, I think that the following would be a fair representation of its ecumenical thought:

> We are all one because of our faith in Christ and in his Gospel. This unity in Christ is the community of believers everywhere which is the church. But our disunity in mission, that is, the church's witness to the world, especially as reflected by Our Lord's prayer, « That all may be one ... that the world may believe », shows that the church is not one visibly. We are thus concerned with the problem of unity; we seek that visible unity willed by Christ for his church. However, we are clear about the general nature of the unity we seek. It is a unity in variety of truth and in diversity of belief, of worship, and of organization. Hence, what we are now seeking is to determine specifically how this unity in diversity is to be realized visibly.

---

[24] St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1958.
[25] Op. cit., p. 86.

Besides the intrinsic difficulties which such a plan for unity reveals, there is the ever-present fact that American Protestantism's concern for unity is interlaced with a jealous adherence to independence and denominationalism. The message of the Oberlin Conference clearly indicates this. « To proclaim that Christ is the one Lord is to give him pre-eminence over all else — over our most cherished traditions. This we have not done » [26].

Perhaps the great difficulty behind the reluctance of Protestant denominations to go the whole way and sell their independence for the pearl of religious unity is the fear of a super-church or monolithic structure. In America, especially, independence of thought and action and the « right » to form new denominations has been ingrained into the national habit. As a consequence, many leaders fear centralization of authority, a big church, conformity, and numerous other ills that they think will come with a greater degree of religious unity and organic union. Strangely enough, however, it would seem that the majority of Protestant laymen do not have these fears. In 1950 the American Institute of Public Opinion asked a representative group of people the following question.

> A committee of church people in the U. S. is studying a plan whereby all Protestant churches in this country would join to form a single Protestant church. What is your feeling about an idea of this kind. Would you be in favor of it or opposed to it?

50 % of the answers were in favor of the idea, 39% were opposed, and 11 % had no opinion. When asked about what the attitude of their own church would be on the formation of a single Protestant church in America, 45 % thought it would be opposed and only 28 % in favor of it with 27 % having no opinion [27].

The second characteristic of the Ecumenical Movement in America is a concern over the « church ». This is a new development in Protestantism, at least outside of Anglicanism. A number of years ago few Protestant theologians took the church as a subject of serious study. It was looked upon as secondary to the individual's conversion to God and as something more or less accidental, an optional society formed by people interested in getting together. Today, however, there is a large theological literature devoted to the church and it is seen by many as an essential entity in the

---

[26] Official Report, op. cit, p. 28.

[27] *A Guide to the Religions of America*, ed. by Leo Rosten, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1955), p. 244.

plans of God for the salvation of men. This is indeed a change; there are several reasons for the remarkable development.

Perhaps the first and foremost reason for an increased interest and concern for the doctrine of the church is the general situation of widespread secularism in the United States. Such a situation stems in large part from the separation of church and state in America together with a loss of prestige and power for religion by reason of the high number of denominations. As a result of the weakened condition of religion there is a tremendous number of churchless people. Recently, however, the churches have awakened to the seriousness of the situation and have put forth renewed efforts to get people to go to church.

Still another factor is similarly helping in a negative way by pointing up dangers: excessive scientism alongside the lessening of Protestant power in the United States. The present space-age, initiated by Sputnik I, has increased the already high regard for science. Many Protestants see the necessity of counterbalancing such an emphasis by a proper evaluation of the place of religion and church-attendance in life. Such efforts are aided by the feeling that Protestantism has lost its dominant position in America and hence must put forth a vigorous campaign.

A second reason for new interest in the idea of « church » is the present day concern for community and togetherness. The ideal of man as a being standing solitary in all his natural glory, which was born of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century and which inspired much of the liberalism and humanism of the nineteenth century, enkindles no spark of enthusiasm in the twentieth century. Today men wish to identify themselves with a status, a social stratum, a community. Many voices of protest are heard reproaching modern man for too much conformity and too litfle courage to stand out and be different, but the truth is that he cannot help it. Individualism has failed to give him the security that he desires. Modern man, adrift in a sea of secularism and lost among numerous denominational islands of religion, has grasped at counterfeits: Communism, Nazism, Fascism. These movements offer only specious hope to people. We know that. The point is, however, that men today feel the need of belonging and of being together in the security of community. Communism is a perversion of this need, but even outside of the Red Circle, the spirit of togetherness is manifested in the drift to conformism and collectivism.

In such a situation it is evident that some might turn again to Christianity. There is a special difficulty in America where there are so many churches, but the recent surge in attendance at all

churches shows how deeply people feel the inner urge to belong to something. No doubt there are theological difficulties in attendance for the sake of status or simply to fulfill a psychological need, but nevertheless the interest in church-going is present.

A third factor in the revival of study on the « church » has been the discoveries of biblical theology. Formerly, Protestants like Harnack and Bultmann denied that Christ intended to found a church. They held that the church was a development that did not have a foundation in the Gospels. Modern scholarship, however, has discovered that the formation of a community of believers, or, in other words, a church, was one of the prime purposes of Christ. Such a change of thought is bound to have profound influences in the development of Protestant ecclesiology.

A final reason for the new interest is the rise of the Ecumenical Movement itself with its twofold concern for unity and for the mission of the « church » to the world. George S. Hendry, who has an excellent article on « The Theological Context of the Church Today » in *The Ecumenical Era in Church and Society,* says very truly: « The ecumenical movement arose primarily out of an awakened concern with the mission of the Church, which has promoted a salutary process of self-questioning on the part of the Churches that were drawn into it »[28]. In other words, a renewed interest came naturally and necessarily from the attempts to present the « church » to others. Missionaries had to understand what they were presenting. On the other hand, it was natural that the Ecumenical Movement towards unity should also bring about a search for the nature of that unity and the concept of that church which the proponents of the Movement wished to achieve.

A third characteristic of the Ecumenical Movement in the United States is the attention accorded to nondoctrinal factors. At the Oberlin Conference the study groups considered in some detail the sociological and cultural elements existing today which are having a profound influence on the quest for unity. The mobility of a large segment of the American people, for example, shifting place to place with surprising speed has had a notable effect on parish life. One family out of four and one person out of five moves every year and in the new location often does not consider a former denominational loyalty sufficient reason to seek out the same denomination for church-attendance. The new shift from cities to suburbs also has had an effect on the membership of various congregations and denominations. Changes of social status on the part of former immigrants and racial groups, such as the

---

[28] Op. cit., p. 41.

Negroes in America, through increased prosperity and education has caused many changes in the complexion of denominational life. The experience of millions of young people in interdenominational worship at college or in the armed forces has led to a greater disposition for the search for unity. Such sociological and cultural changes as the ones mentioned above, which perhaps are taking place with greater rapidity in the United States than elsewhere, necessarily influence ecumenical thinking and the American Ecumenical Movement rightly considers them in its deliberations over the problem of unity.

A fourth characteristic of the American Ecumenical Movement is the widespread activity of laymen. The tremendous work of lay study groups who prepared material for the Conference at Oberlin has already been noted. Thousands of people across the country joined in « ecumenical conversations » and spent many hours in studying the issues that are basic to the problem of Protestantism and the Ecumenical Movement.

Another exemplification of the role of laymen is their work across denominational lines in both local parishes and in local councils. Such work is often non-doctrinal and more in the fields of economics, education, and family life but with solid repercussion in ecumenical endeavors. Local agencies engage in the alleviation of hunger, poverty, and disease. They are concerned about social justice and community welfare. Christian family life is encouraged and family troubles solved. Work is done to eliminate racial discrimination and to provide for Christian education. Above all, in many denominations and on the local level an awareness of the necessity for Christian fellowship helps to build up a sense of the need for a greater unity among the denominations.

Conclusion: No attempt has been made throughout this study of Protestants and the Ecumenical Movement in the United States to give a critique of the American Ecumenical Movement from a Catholic point of view. Were such an evaluation to be made, it would no doubt be easy to show how far short the Movement comes on the basis of Catholic theology and ecclesiology. A better method, and one the present writer hopes has been accomplished to some degree at least, is to present fairly and objectively the present state of things in American Protestantism and in the Ecumenical Movement. It is clear that this Movement is far from the goal that it has set for itself; it is even further from the unity of the Catholic Church. Yet its efforts are not insignificant nor to be simply dismissed as inconsequential. In many ways the Ecu-

menical Movement has brought about some reversal of the manifold tendencies engendered by the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century: partisanship, denominationalism, excessive individualism, and loss of social charity. The present day, on the other hand, is witnessing an earnest and soul-searching quest for unity, a real desire to fulfill Christ's will, and the ever firmer realization that the Gospel calls for a visible unity and a visible church. No matter how imperfect, these tendencies are good; it can only be our hope and our prayer that they find their fulfillment in the only way they can — within the Roman Catholic Church.

Fr. Roger Matzerath, S. A.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An important papal document regarding the second Vatican Council

Ever since His Holiness Pope John XXIII proclaimed a new ecumenical council on the occasion of his visit to the Basilica of St. Paul on January 25, 1959, *a great deal of activity has been going in various sectors of the Catholic Church to lay the groundwork for the proceedings of the Council. From time to time the Pope has publicly referred to the work being done and has expressed his satisfaction with its progress.*

One of the most important recent papal pronouncements dealing with the coming Council was an allocution delivered in St. Peter's Basilica on the eve of Pentecost in June in which Pope John established ten preparatory commissions and two secretariats to draw up the material to be considered by those who will be attending the Second Vatican Council. A most significant point in this Motu Proprio *of the Holy Father was his appointment of a special secretariat for unity, the purpose of which is to serve as a liaison between the Holy See and separated Christian groups against the background of the Council. We are reproducing below the English translation of the* Motu Proprio *which appeared in the London* Tablet *of June* 18:

It is as a direct inspiration of the Most High that we have regarded the thought, that flower of an unforeseen spring, which from the first days of our pontificate presented itself to our mind — the summoning of an Oecumenical Council. Indeed, from this solemn gathering of Bishops around the Roman Pontiff, the Church, beloved spouse of Christ, can acquire in these troubled times a new and even wider renown. By this means there is quickened once more the hope that those who, though claiming the name of Christian, are yet separated from this Apostolic See, may listen to the voice of the Divine Shepherd and approach the one Church.

On January 25th, 1959, the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul the Apostle, having taken part in the sacred ceremonies at the Ostian Basilica, we declared openly to the Sacred College of Car-

dinals our intention of summoning an Oecumenical Council. They received the anouncement with great joy and warm good wishes for its outcome. Then, on May 17th following, the Feast of Pentecost, to ensure that the preliminary work might be carried out with promptness and diligence, we named an antepreparatory commission for the Oecumenical Council, composed of selected dignitaries of the Roman Curia, and presided over by our dear son, Cardinal Domenico Tardini, our Secretary of State.

On the occasion of our first Encyclical Letter, we made it clear that the Oecumenical Council was being held with this primary object:

> « The growth of the Catholic Faith and the renewal along right lines of the habits of Christian people, and the adapting of ecclesiastical discipline to the needs and conditions of the present time. That event will surely be a wonderful manifestation of truth, unity and charity. It will be a manifestation indeed which we hope will be received by those who behold it but who are separated from this Apostolic See, as a gentle invitation to seek and find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father ». (*Ad Petri Cathedram,* June 29th, 1959, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* Vol. 50, p. 511).

We further established that the future Council would be named the Second Vatican Council, after the place in which it would be held.

The antepreparatory commission has, with the greatest diligence, concluded the task we entrusted to it. It has made contact with all the Bishops in order to obtain their advice and suggestions touching the matters to be treated in the Council. It has carefully arranged the material contained in more than two thousand replies which Bishops and prelates gladly sent with messages of good will. It has placed all this at the disposal of the Sacred Congregations of the Roman Curia, which have been able with great advantage to draw therefrom the proposals they have put before us. In addition, Catholic universities and institutes of ecclesiastical studies, moved by like desires, have contributed proposals and results of research which will be of great benefit to the Church.

We have personally followed these exploratory labours, conducted with accuracy and care, and we have undertaken to examine personally with the greatest attention the suggestions and advice of the Bishops, the proposals of the Sacred Congregations of the Roman Curia, the desires and studies of the universities. We

therefore give our most earnest thanks to God that our proposal has evoked such generous and fervent labours on the part of our venerable brethren and dear sons.

Now it seems clear with what subjects, taken from the material gathered together in such abundance, the forthcoming Oecumenical Council ought to busy itself for the good of the Church and the salvation of souls. Consequently the time has come to proceed, with God's help, to the setting up of the commissions which have to devote themselves to the study of the matters which it will be possible to have discussed at the Council. They will be made up of Cardinals, Bishops, and ecclesiastics noted for their virtue and learning, from both the diocesan and religious clergy, chosen from different parts of the world, so that, in this respect also, the catholicity of the Church may be displayed.

By this present *Motu Proprio,* therefore, we make the following disposition:

1) In order to prepare for the Second Vatican Oecumenical Council, preparatory commissions are being established, and their function is to study the subjects selected by us, while keeping before them the wishes expressed by the Bishops and the proposals of the Sacred Congregations of the Roman Curia.

2) The individual commissions will be able to divide at need into sections and subcommissions.

3) Each commission will have a president and a definite number of members. The president will be a Cardinal. Members will be chosen from the ranks of the Bishops and distinguished ecclesiastics.

4) To each separate commission there will be attached some consultors chosen from men with special competence.

5) Each commission will have its own secretary.

6) The president and the members of each of the commissions will be chosen by us, and likewise the consultors and the secretary.

7) Preparatory commissions have been established. If need arises, others can be constituted at our good pleasure. The commissions are as follows:

i) The theological commission, whose task it is to weigh questions touching Holy Scripture, sacred traditions, the Faith and its practices.

ii) The commission for the Bishops and diocesan government.

iii) The commission for the discipline of the clergy and faithful.

iv) The commission for religious.
v) The commission for the discipline of the sacraments.
vi) The commission for the sacred liturgy.
vii) The commission for studies and seminaries.
viii) The commission for the Eastern Church.
ix) The commission for the missions.
x) The commission for the lay apostolate in all questions having reference to Catholic Action in the religious and social fields.

8) Moreover, a secretariat has been established to deal with questions touching modern means of communicating ideas (press, radio, television, cinema, etc.). The secretariat will be directed by a prelate nominated by us, and will have members and consultors, likewise of our choosing.

9) Then, as a token of our affection and good will towards those who bear the name of Christian but are separated from this Apostolic See, to enable them to follow the work of the council and to find more easily the path by which they may arrive at that unity for which « Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father », we are establishing a special « advisory board » or secretariat, presided over by a Cardinal whom we shall choose, and organised in the same manner as the commissions.

10) Lastly, there is being set up a central commission over which we ourselves will preside, either in person or through a Cardinal especially appointed by us. Members of the central commission will be the presidents of each of the commissions, some other Cardinals, as well as some Bishops from different parts of the world.

11) To the central commission will be attached a certain number of advisers chosen from the Bishops and prominent ecclesiastics.

12) The central commission will have its own secretary, who will be secretary-general.

13) The members of the central commission will be chosen by our authority, as likewise will be the advisers and the secretary-general.

14) The task of the central commission will be to follow the course of the labours of the individual commissions and, where necessary, to co-ordinate them. It will report their conclusions to us so that we may be able to decide the subjects to be treated in the Oecumenical Council. It is also the business of the central commission to propose the rules for the orderly procedure of the future Council.

15) Finally, appropriate secretariats will be established to see to the economic and technical side of the holding of the Council.

All that we have considered useful to establish in this statement we will and command to remain unchanged and decided, exactly as it has been established, in whole and in each of its parts, anything to contrary notwithstanding.

* * *

Archbishop Andreas Sheptytsky and the Jewish Community in Galicia during the Second World War

The Annals *of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States recently carried an interesting article on the late Archbishop Andreas Sheptytsky of Lviv, one of the outstanding figures of the Catholic Eastern Church of this century. Metropolitan Sheptytsky, who took a deep personal interest in the relations between the Church of Rome and the separated Christians of the East (Cf.* Unitas, *vol.* v, 104-105 *and vol.* viii, 7-14), *was also recognized as a friend and benefactor of the Jews.*

In the article in question, Mr. Kurt I. Lewin, the son of a rabbi of the Jewish community in Galicia during the second world war, relates in a moving way how Archbishop Sheptytsky intervened in behalf of the persecuted Jews in the Ukraine.

We are reproducing this account with the kind permission of the writer and of the editor of the Annals *of the Ukrainian Academy.*

The city of Lviv lies at the crossroads of the old trade routes leading from the shores of the Black Sea into Central Europe, and thus East and West met in its market place. It was a curious blend of the old and the new, where the Renaissance Boim Chapel was attached to a Romanesque church, and a baroque Cathedral looked down upon the city from Mount St. George. The inhabitants — Armenians, Greeks, Jews, Poles and Ukrainians — reflected the catholicity of the city which has been compared with Florence.

Trade flourished from the fourteenth through the sixteenth centuries; merchants came and went and the market hummed with activity. Venice, Genoa and Florence maintained their representatives in Lviv for the express purpose of protecting their merchants and relaying to their respective governments information concerning mercantile developments.

However in the middle of the seventeenth century a decline set in, caused first by the Cossack and then by the Turkish wars,

and thus the importance of Lviv gradually diminished. The city enjoyed a renascence in the days of the Habsburg rulers, who made it the capital of the province of Galicia and the seat of the provincial parliament and the Governors. After the First World War a decline in the importance of the city had set in again while the Second World War destroyed the character of Lviv completely. The population was either killed during the war or deported afterwards. There is still a city called Lviv but it is inhabited mainly by strangers. What is left are its houses, its old buildings, and its beautiful churches.

Before 1939, there were approximately 100,000 Jews living in Lviv, members of an old community which traced its origin to the thirteenth century. In its time the community had numbered many scholars who were widely known, as well as artisans and craftsmen whose work was valued in many quarters. Being old, the Jewish community in Lviv had weathered many storms through the years: the Tartar raids in the thirteenth century, the Cossack wars in the seventeenth, and the Polish pogroms of 1919. Its records are filled with descriptions of turbulence, persecution, and suffering.

However, the Jewish community in Lviv could not weather the storm of the Second World War. Its members died in the gas chambers of Belzec, were shot in the ghetto and killed in the Janowski concentration camp and, when the holocaust ended, only three hundred registered with the Jewish Committee, after the Germans withdrew. The charming city with its lovely gardens and its beautiful and graceful architecture had been a backdrop for tragedy and suffering.

Israel had few friends in its hour of need. The local people were either indifferent to the fate of the Jews or actively participated in killing them. Few showed any compassion, and even fewer made an attempt to help. But in their hour of need, the Jews did find a friend in His Excellency, the Metropolitan Andreas Sheptytsky.

The Metropolitan Sheptytsky headed the Church, which had united with Rome in the sixteenth century. A scion of the old nobility, whose title dated back to the thirteenth century, the Metropolitan Andreas dedicated his life to his Church and to the welfare of the Ukrainian people. He reorganized and revitalized the Church in the parishes of his diocese, and set out to restore the rich Byzantine tradition, in which the Greek Catholic Church had its origin and roots in liturgy, vestments, and Church art. Under his aegis, education and guidance appeared in backward Ukrainian villages. Schools and hospitals were built for the use

and benefit of his people, payed for by the revenues from the landed estates held by the Sheptytsky family in Galicia. In fact, a princely income from private holdings was devoted to the education and improvement of the community, while the owner of the property went about dressed in a clean and carefully mended monk's habit which had seen better days. In brief, the Metropolitan Andreas Sheptytsky was a true spiritual leader of the Ukrainian community, respected and loved by his followers and even by those who disagreed with him.

Galicia did not escape the stirrings of nationalism that rumbled in Europe through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It made its appearance there in a virulent form at the beginning of this century, increasing and sharpening friction, discord and hatred among the various national and religious groups. But the surge of Ukrainian nationalism could be used to further the German policy of « Drang nach Osten », and consequently the German government attempted to utilize the movement for its own ends, thus adding fat to an already brightly burning fire through an effective campaign of anti-Polish and anti-Jewish propaganda.

The Jews were caught in a cross current of Polish suspicions of favoring the Ukrainian cause, and Ukrainian certainty that the forced « Polonization » by the government had Jewish support. The backdrop for the Jewish tragedy had been set [1].

In the midst of this political whirlpool, the Metropolitan Andreas did not limit himself to spiritual matters. He restrained the Ukrainian nationalists, he tried to bridge the gap between the Ukrainian factions, in an attempt to prevent a hopeless blood bath. He clearly understood the political constellation of the times and foresaw future developments; again and again his voice was heard in warning against harmful political influences both from the East and from the West and, as early as 1933, he bade the Ukrainians to beware of becoming pawns in a German game [2]. However, his wise counsel was lost in the din of nationalism and the warnings went unheeded. To the Jews the Metropolitan Andreas had always been a friend, respecting their heritage with compassion for their sorrow and suffering. The Jews responded with respect and deep affection. Whenever the Metropolitan visited a township or village, he was met by the Ukrainian community led by its priest and by the rabbi and the elders of the Jewish community, a strange sight in a country where intolerance and hatred thrived.

---

[1] The political events described above took place all through the 1930's.

[2] A personal communication by Father Herman Budzinsky and Father Nykanor, Studite monks who heard this at the St. Uspensky Church in Univ, in a speech made by the Metropolitan Andreas.

The Metropolitan's residence was a small baroque palace, opposite the Cathedral, both built at the same time. The gate had an iron chain for a bell pull, and brother Athanasius, a Studite monk, was there to open the door and show the way to the waiting room on the second floor, constantly filled with people, all waiting patiently to be received. The door was always open to anyone who cared to enter. Peasant delegations, Basilian nuns, priests, men in uniform, all came and equally waited their turn. Occasionally a Jewish delegation, sent by one of the communities located near the Metropolitan's estates, sat waiting to ask for a donation to a Jewish charity. In fact the synagogues of some of these little towns were built with lumber donated by the Metropolitan. The atmosphere in the waiting room was one of silence and expectancy as if those present were on the verge of a deep and unforgettable experience. The audience took place in a large, sunny room lined with book shelves. Next to a huge desk in a wheelchair sat a very tall, white-haired man, with penetrating blue eyes — Andreas Count Sheptytsky, Archbishop of Lviv, Metropolitan of Halych. The Metropolitan's crippled legs were covered by a rough blanket, but despite the wheelchair, he conveyed an impression of strength and power. His right hand, disfigured and deformed by illness but nevertheless beautiful with long thin fingers, motioned the visitor to come closer, to sit down, to be frank and open. A strange atmosphere of warmth, kindness, sincerity and affection combined with strength and power pervaded the room. Sunlight drifted through the open windows and the smell of the orchards wafted in together with distant voices of men working in the garden. Whatever his troubles, one felt at peace in the Metropolitan Andreas' office and left it strengthened and uplifted [3].

The Second World War broke out. Lviv was bombed by the *Luftwaffe* on the very first day. With the explosion of the first bomb, a way of life was destroyed. When the Germans occupied Lviv in 1941, matters were made even more difficult because of discord and lack of cooperation among the various national groups. The Jewish community became the prime target of pogroms, persecution, and outright killing, with the Germans instigating and encouraging anti-Jewish riots. They marked every Jew with the Star of David in order to have the victims easily recognizable. The Jews were deprived of protection by law, and of any basic human rights. Immediately after the entry of German troops, anti-Jewish riots started in which many thousands of Jewish in-

---

[3] That is how Metropolitan Andreas appeared in 1937-39.

habitants of Lviv lost their lives. The pogrom was organized by the Germans, but the atrocities were committed by the Polish and Ukrainian mobs. Rabbi Dr. Jechezkiel Lewin, the last Chief Rabbi of that city, decided to go to Metropolitan Andreas to ask for his intervention with the rioting mob. He came to Metropolitan Andreas as his friend and because the Metropolitan was the only person of influence who was willing to listen, and willing to help. It was futile to approach the Germans and, unfortunately, it was almost as futile to approach leaders of other communities.

These were the late Rabbi Dr. Lewin's words:

> I came to you, Your Excellency, in the name of the Jewish community in Lviv. I came to you in the name of half a million Jews living in the territory under your ecclesiastic jurisdiction. Sometime ago you told me that you consider yourself a friend of the Jews. I ask you now, in the hour of mortal danger, to give evidence of your friendship. I ask you to save thousands of human lives [4].

Rabbi Lewin departed with the Metropolitan's promise that everything would be done to help. Metropolitan Andreas tried to prevent Rabbi Lewin from returning to his home while the riots were raging through the city. Rabbi Lewin refused the offer of shelter with thanks, stating that his place was with his people [5]. He died a martyr's death, at the Brygidki prison, in a heroic attempt to protect his beloved community.

The Metropolitan kept his promise. Throughout the German occupation he helped and sheltered Jews, restrained members of his Church in the name of Christ, or threatened punishment and political consequences after the war. He published a pastoral letter pertaining to Jews, entitled appropriately: « Thou shalt not kill ». Naturally the Germans confiscated this writing but nevertheless its text was read in every Greek Catholic church. The letter discussed the treatment of Jews frankly and courageously, and its message carried a grave warning to the Ukrainians, enjoining them from direct or indirect participation in exterminating Jews.

However, this restraining influence was not always effective. Outside sources unleashed hatred and savagery, which made the

---

[4] This speech was written by the late Rabbi Lewin before setting out to the Metropolitan's palace. This writer, who is Rabbi Dr. J. Lewin's son, translated the speech into Ukrainian, a language with which his father was only slightly acquainted.

[5] This was related to the author by the Metropolitan himself.

masses either callous or stone deaf. Although the Metropolitan's views and advice were read from every pulpit, the German influence on the local population during the first two years of the occupation was too strong. The Metropolitan Andreas went so far as to send a letter of protest to the « Hangman of Europe », Heinrich Himmler, voicing a strong objection against employing the Ukrainian youth to help exterminate the Jews. There is little doubt that the Metropolitan Andreas was one of the very few spiritual and political leaders under the German occupation who dared to protest against the calculated and cold-blooded mass murder of the Jews [6].

No one doubted that the Jewish community would once again have to face a time of danger, trial and tribulation, and it was obvious that large numbers would succumb to the pogroms, or to the persecution. But even the worst pessimists did not envisage the extermination of the whole community. At first the consensus held was that, as soon as the front line moved further on, a status quo would be achieved, and the population would quiet down. But as weeks and months passed the lot of the Jews grew worse and worse. Over the first wave of vindictive killing caused by hatred, was superimposed an organized and systematic operation designed to strip the Jewish population of its wealth, and simultaneously to employ Jewish man-power at forced labor. This in turn was replaced by a well-thought-out plan of physical destruction: first the old and disabled, then the children, then the breaking up of families by separation of men from women, and then the terribly final road to the gas chamber. The German machine ground slowly but surely as train after train left Western Ukraine to Belzec, the graveyard of almost 2,000,000 Jews. Town after town was emptied of its Jews and large signboards declaring « Judenrein » were placed at the approaches to each town.

The Metropolitan Andreas became interested in the details of daily life within the ghettos. How did people manage? What was the amount of their bread rations? [7] What was happening to the children? Who took care of the sick? To obtain answers to these questions he appointed Father Kotiv to collect information about events in the ghettos. And in addition to his previous course of action, the Metropolitan now embarked on a positive campaign

---

[6] The author worked in the Metropolitan's library and archives in 1943-1944, where he saw a copy of the letter sent to Himmler, and Himmler's reply in which he advised the Metropolitan not to interfere in affairs which did not concern him.

[7] During the German occupation bread and other foods were rationed. The Jews received approximately one tenth of the normal ration.

to save and shelter individual Jews; those whom he knew, and total strangers, adults and children, in fact any Jew whom he could help [8].

The moving force behind this operation was the Metropolitans's brother Klemens Sheptytsky, head of the Order of St. Theodore the Studite [9]. Over six feet tall, slim, he was an ascetic-looking man in his late sixties, with a touch of severity in his face. But appearances were misleading, and this monk, who may very well have stepped down from a Byzantine ikon of St. Theodore the Studite, possessed warmth, infinite understanding and boundless compassion. Father Hegumen Klemens carried the actual burden of sheltering the Jews, and arranging their swift removal when the local people were about to notify the Germans that Jews were to be found.

By 1942 it was quite clear to everyone concerned that the Germans planned to solve permanently the Jewish problem in the gas chambers. Whoever could and had the strength to do so tried to escape this horrible death. Jews hid in cellars and in forest dugouts, they were camouflaged by forged papers or moved to strange places under assumed names. The Germans countered these desperate efforts at escape with a proclamation that sheltering or helping Jews in any way whatsoever carried the death penalty. Many Christians were indeed publicly shot or hanged for aiding their fellow men. Official announcements were printed in newspapers, and walls were plastered with them everywhere. In addition, a positive inducement of food was offered to informers who led the Germans or the local police to hiding places of Jews. Thus, thousands who escaped from the ghetto were led to their death by these present-day Judases, who bartered lives for food instead of the traditional thirty pieces of silver. Some among the local population, who did not act as informers, were nevertheless pleased with the prospect of looting, which the liquidation of the Jews afforded, and so favored the act itself. Like vultures such persons circled around the ghetto buying wedding rings for a loaf of bread, and burgling houses whose occupants were already on the road to death. The great part of the population was completely indifferent to the human agony before their eyes, and the terror, hatred, and German encouragement of anti-semitism completely deadened the sensibilities of the people.

---

[8] The Metropolitan undertook this task in the summer of 1942, when the destruction of the ghettos began.

[9] Theodore of Studium, Saint, 759-826 A.D., Byzantine, also called St. Theodore the Studite. His influence was critical in the history of the monastic role of the Byzantine Church.

In this poisonous atmosphere the Metropolitan Andreas and Father Proto-Hegumen Klemens launched their work of saving Jews. Despite the danger from the Germans and the hostility of the population toward any acts of succor to the hunted, both men succeeded in inspiring bravery and even heroism in those around them. This labor of saving Jews was possible only because of the cooperation of a small army of monks and nuns together with some secular priests. They gathered the Jews into their monasteries and convents, orphanages and hospitals, shared their bread with the fugitives, and acted as escorts with total disregard of the danger of Jewish company. Whenever necessary, they disrupted the rhythm of their beloved monastic life to carry on these activities, so remote from their daily life. Some of them, taught and guided by the Metropolitan Andreas, reached a new height in spiritual life, spread the teachings of their great Prince of the Church among the people, and followed his path in all things. They were the ones most active in giving aid and comfort to the hunted fugitives. Others, never completely free of their anti-Jewish prejudice, nevertheless helped Jews because of their abhorrence of German cruelty. There were those who were indifferent but, on being summoned to help, obeyed that summons with eagerness and selflessness. All of them, regardless of motive or attitude, equally shared the grave peril, and helped to provide Jews with shelter and food. But most important of all, they gave moral support to those whom they hid, and hunted Jews deprived of every human right and stripped of any sort of protection, were made to feel wanted and thus allowed to regain faith in humanity. And those monks, nuns and priests kept faith by their silence. For two long years no outsider knew about the Jews who were hidden in each and every cloister, and even in the Metropolitan's private residence.

The monks and nuns of the Order of St. Theodore the Studite unquestionably executed the instructions given by the Metropolitan Andreas or Father Proto-Hegumen Klemens, and the Superior of each cloister led his monastery or her convent in this noble undertaking.

Father Superior Marko Stek was in charge of « operation save the Jews » at the Studite monasteries. To accomplish this task, he first carefully paved the way for reception of individual Jews, sometimes by an explanation only, sometimes by a convincing talk, and sometimes even by a resort to monastic discipline. Then the requisite documents had to be prepared, and finally, the « naturalized Ukrainians » had to be provided with an escort and transported from place to place.

Strange things, indeed, were happening to Father Marko in those days. He was to be found travelling in a railroad car with two lively Jewish boys. Once he had to tackle the delicate problem of a married Jewish woman who « entered » a convent as a « novice » in a very early stage of pregnancy! Another day, on returning to his cell from the evening prayers, sung so beautifully by the monks of the Lychakiv Monastery, he discovered waiting there three little boys aged three to five. The children had to be removed from Bryukhovychi, where they had been cared for by the parish priest, Father Pobereyko, because a neighbor had informed the Germans of their presence. Until a new hiding place was found, Father Marko shared his monk's cell with his little guests. In this difficult work, Father Marko was ably assisted by Fathers Nykanor, Tyt, Herman, and the Studite monks.

While the Studite Fathers looked after the men, girls and women were cared for by the Studite nuns headed by Mother Superior Josepha. But it is impossible to omit Mother Superior Monika, of the Order of St. Basil the Great, from the list of those who saved Jewish children. At the convent in Pidmykhailivtsi, Mother Monika gathered the boys and girls, helping them to adjust in the shift from the warmth of their parents' homes to the new circumstances of life. All those sheltered by Metropolitan Andreas survived the war in spite of constant searchers, informers and other dangers.

It should be stressed that Metropolitan Andreas and his brother exerted no religious pressure whatsoever. Their attitude was that conversions under the circumstances would not be an expression of free will. This policy was followed by the monks and the nuns. Approximately one hundred and fifty Jews survived, thanks to Metropolitan Andreas. Although this figure is a small one, to save that number required untold efforts and exertion. Only survivors of the holocaust can appreciate the difficulty and danger encountered in saving even one life.

In the autumn of 1943, Rabbi Dr. David Kahane and the author arrived at the monastery of St. Josaphat, near Mount St. George. A short time afterward, Father Superior Nykanor informed the assembled monks that from now on two Jews were to stay with them. He stated that it would be advisable if one member of the monastery were to take the whole responsibility on himself and thus protect others in case of detection. All the monks realized that they were in mortal danger and that one of them was called upon to risk his life for men of a different faith. Father Nykanor, a tall, soft-spoken man, still showing traces of a year and a half spent in a German prison, then asked for a

volunteer. As one man, the whole monastery stood up — old Brother Varlaam, Brother Yerotey the printer, young Brother Lazarus the novice, Brother Ambrose, Brother Patrick, Brother Joseph the cook, Brother Modest the carpenter. Last but not least there was Brother Theodosius who, in addition, conducted a private crusade against the Germans by hiding two Jewish families at the factory where he worked. Stillness pervaded the whitewashed room, and the monastic community of St. Josaphat was closer to God than ever.

After the German retreat, the Metropolitan helped those he had sheltered to start life anew. The children were placed with the few remaining Jewish families, but only after approval of the foster parents by Rabbi Dr. Kahane. Father Proto-Hegumen Klemens stated: « The children are a trust left to me by their dead parents: I can release them only to the care of responsible people ».

The pitifully few survivors gathered on Yablonovska Street, where a Jewish committee was organized. There was no one to give aid or comfort except the Metropolitan Andreas, who sent food, clothes and blankets to the committee.

Slowly the survivors dispersed. Today they live in Israel and England, the United States and Australia. But to all these far places they took with them the memory of Metropolitan Andreas and his brother Klemens, and that memory will remain in their hearts till the day they die.

In those tragic times a great and noble man lived on Mount St. George. He had a heart full of compassion for human suffering and misery. He truly earned the name « friend of the Jews », as he had described himself many years before all these events, and he proved it in the darkest hour at the risk of his own life. His name will be inscribed forever in the annals of Jewish history.

KURT I. LEWIN

* * *

A LETTER OF A FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION MEMBER TO POPE JOHN XXIII

We are publishing below the text of a letter addressed to His Holiness Pope John XXIII by the Reverend J. Robert Nelson, one of the well-known figures of the World Council of Churches. The letter was originally sent to the Cardinal Secretary of State of His Holiness on the First Sunday of Advent, 1959, and subsequently published in the Christian Century. *It is with the courteous*

permission of the editors of that periodical that we are presenting this interesting document to the readers of Unitas.

YOUR HOLINESS: The season of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ awakens joy in the soul of every Christian. This is our response to that moment in « the fulness of time when God sent forth His Son, born of woman, born under the law, to redeem those who were under the law, so that we might receive adoption as sons ». (Galatians 4:4) But we who have been made sons of God by the Divine Incarnation do not all live in the state of reconciliation and unity which God's Son willed us to do. Our separation and schism are both sinful and painful.

By God's grace, Your Holiness has been called to the See of Rome at a time when Christians of every communion are notably sensitive to division and ardently desirous of unity. And Your own actions and pronouncements have raised the hopes of many who long for the healing of the wounds in the Body of Christ. A spirit of true Christian charity is expressed in Your recent Encyclical *Ad Petri cathedram* when the words of the venerable Saint Augustine are quoted: « They will cease to be our brethren only when they shall cease to say the Our Father ». Many of us who worship in churches not in communion with the Holy See apply these words reciprocally to Roman Catholic Christians. But brotherhood in Christ remains a fractured fraternity because of ecclesiastical schism.

It is clear to us that the Roman Catholic Church asserts unequivocally that the fulness of unity can be attained only by conversion to herself. It is equally clear that many of us, who may be willing to consider certain modifications of our faith if required for the sake of the truth of the Gospel, cannot conceivably accept the gracious invitation extended in the Encyclical. Yet we believe that love and truth and unity belong together as one perfect expression of the Divine will, no one of which may be opposed to the other. Love does not need to wait until truth is wholly agreed upon and unity made manifest. As my personal friend, a Jesuit theologian, has said: « Sympathy without knowledge is futile; knowledge without sympathy is sterile ». Or as the great Apostle Saint Paul wrote: « Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things » — even such things as our lack of understanding and our deep divisions over worship and dogma. So as Christians, whether Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, or Protestant, our first duty towards one another is to express the love of Christ which constrains us. And our second duty is to

gain knowledge of one another in such common meeting, dialogue, and worship as our faith and conscience allow.

While we divided Christians may not all be disposed to seek unity by absorption, we are being faithful to our Lord when we do all we can to reduce animosity, oppose prejudice, and remove the barriers to liberty of conscience. Even more, despite our divisions, we can find many occasions for entering into Christian solidarity through mutual support and common defense against the great and increasing enemies of Christ's Church which rage in the world today. And we can pray for each other's sanctification in faith, and for the full revealing of that churchly unity which God intends us to enjoy in this earthly life.

As preparations continue for the coming General Council we shall watch and study with keen interest. We hope, too, that the circle of Roman Catholics who take friendly interest in the Ecumenical Movement will continue to expand with the encouragement of Your Holiness.

Respectfully Yours in the Service of Jesus Christ,

J. Robert Nelson, Dr. theol.
Dean and Professor of Theology

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Pope John Establishes Secretariat for Unity in Connection with Ecumenical Council

In an allocution delivered in St. Peter's Basilica on the eve of Pentecost, Pope John XXIII made it known that a great deal of preparatory work with reference to the coming Ecumenical Council had been carried through to completion and that preparations for it had now reached a decisive stage. The Pope's address was given in the form of a *Motu Proprio* (1) which established ten preparatory commissions to study the subjects to be dealt with by the Council and two secretariats — one dealing with present day means of communicating ideas, and the other « to enable Christians separated from the Holy See to follow the work of the Council and find their way more easily towards the Unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His Heavenly Father ». Pope John said that this latter secretariat was created as « a token of our affection and good will towards those who bear the name of Christian but are separated from this Apostolic See .... ».

Shortly after the *Motu Proprio* was promulgated, it was announced that the new secretariat for unity would be headed by Cardinal Augustine Bea of the Jesuit Order, a prominent German Biblical scholar who will be assisted by « cardinals, bishops, and ecclesiastics noted for their virtue and learning, from both the diocesan and religious clergy, chosen from different parts of the world ... ».

At a press conference at Fordham University where he received an honorary degree Cardinal Bea declared that part of the task of secretariat for unity would be to present to the Second Vatican Council an exposition of the views of non-Catholic Christians and to help the latter follow the course of the Council's work, particularly with regard to Christian unity. Stressing the notes

---

1 A translation of this important papal document may be found in the documentary section of this issue of *Unitas*.

of understanding and rapprochement in efforts towards union, the Cardinal said that he and the members of his staff would welcome inquiries and suggestions on the part of non-Catholics on matters of liturgy and discipline, but emphasized that doctrinal concessions would be inadmissible.

In the course of his press conference Cardinal Bea said that prospects of the return of non-Catholic Christians to communion with the Holy See seemed to be more favorable in Germany, Switzerland, France, and England than in other countries. Especially in Germany, he added, recent Biblical studies showed that Protestants there are approaching the Catholic position through their own efforts.

With respect to divergences between the Church of Rome and separated Eastern Christians, these the Cardinal termed as being more psychological than doctrinal, with exception being made to the tenet of papal infallibility.

« Research and points held in common », concluded Cardinal Bea, « should become points of contact, and precisely these contacts will be sought for by the new secretariat ». (*ANSA*)

* * *

Orthodox Patriarch Calls for Reunion of Christian Churches

The world leader of the Eastern Orthodox Churches has recently made a further appeal for a reunion of all Christian churches. In an Easter letter the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople affirmed that it is urgent that the churches find unity again.

« I declared on the tomb of Our Saviour », wrote the Patriarch, « that we feel great pain because the church of Jesus Christ is divided. This separation continues against Christ's will. It is detrimental to the cause for which Christ sacrificed Himself ».

The Patriarch claimed that historical barriers between the churches « do not make impossible their mutual *rapprochement* and meeting, now that the goodwill recently expressed by Christian leaders gives us cause for comfort and enlightenment ».

It will be recalled that shortly after a Christmas appeal for Christian reunion made by His Holiness, Pope John XXIII in 1958, Patriarch Athenagoras welcomed « with joy » the Pope's call and said that such unity « would be the dawn of a really new year in Jesus Christ ». (*NC*)

* * *

World Council Central Committee to Meet in Scotland

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches has chosen St. Andrews in Scotland as the site of its annual meeting this summer. Sessions of the committee, which determines the policy of the World Council, will take place there from August 16 to August 24. The choice of Scotland for this year's meeting was made in view of the fiftieth anniversary of the First World Missionary Conference which took place at Edinburgh in 1910 — an historical convention that gave rise to the international missionary movement which, together with the Faith and Order and Life and Work movements, resulted ultimately in the formation of the World Council at Amsterdam in 1948.

Two of the major concerns which will occupy the members of the Central Committee at St. Andrews will be the role of the W.C.C. in its promotion of church unity, and the problem of over-population.

It is expected that discussion on the World Council's activity with respect to church unity will reveal the growing conviction in different quarters that the function of the Council should be to keep types of closer church union before its members. Up to now the policy of the World Council has been to remain apart from actual union negotiations between church groups and has limited itself to the study of unitive prospects and to supplying the proper framework within which they could be realized.

Among other important topics which will be considered by the Central Committee are: the proposed integration of the World Council of Churches with the International Missionary Council: the final plans for the Third Assembly of the World Council, which will take place at New Delhi from November 8 - December 5, 1961; religious liberty; and tentative proposals for altering the criterion for membership in the World Council (the present Basis requires the acceptance of « our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour » — a basis which many feel should be modified to accord with the doctrine of the Trinity). (*EPS*)

* * *

Group of American Protestants Favors Conversations with Catholics

Meeting at Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, recently a group of fourteen United States Protestant leaders agreed that the present

time is an opportune one for conversations between Protestants and Roman Catholics. The churchmen, who are predominantly of conservative tendencies, were present at a three-day Protestant Council on Roman Catholicism sponsored by Christ's Mission of Sea Cliff, New York.

Conversations of the kind based on « mutual respect », they declared, are necessary to counteract the common foes of secularism, and paganism. At the same time, the churchmen warned that « such conversations will be fruitful only if the complexity of the issues and the deep-seated divergences of the two parties are clearly recognized and not glossed over ». (*EPS*)

* * *

Protestants Urged by Jesuit Editor to Study Theological Role of Mary

Father Walter M. Abbott, S. J., associate editor of *America*, has asked Protestant scholars to take a fresh look at Biblical texts concerning the theological role of Mary, the mother of Christ.

Observing that Mariology — the Catholic doctrine on the Blessed Virgin Mary — is for many Protestants a stumbling block to Christian unity, Father Abbot said:

« Devotion to Our Lady has been presented to the Protestants so long as an insult to Our Lord that they find it difficult even to consider whether devotion to Our Lady is a legitimate development with Biblical authorization ».

The Jesuit editor acknowledged that there are excesses by some Catholics in relation to Mary which continue to disconcert Protestants but he called attention to recent warnings by His Holiness Pope John XXIII against « excesses in devotion to Mary and claims about her » on the one hand, and « diminishing Mary's part in God's plan for mankind » on the other.

Father Abbott pointed out that the title « Mother of God » was used in reference to Mary in the early ecumenical councils long before the coming of Protestantism. He said further that it would likewise help considerably if Protestants « would not take alarm » when a Catholic bishop proposes study of the question of « Our Lady as ' co-redemptrix ' » at the coming ecumenical council.

Consultations between Protestant and Catholic scholars on scriptural questions, he concluded, would lead to greater knowledge of what the Biblical texts actually tell us. (*NC*).

* * *

European Youth Express Concern for Christian Unity

According to a survey recently conducted under the auspices of the Youth Department of the World Council of Churches, European Christian youth are more than ever taken up with the problem of disunity and of the weaknesses engendered by it. They are thoroughly impatient with the present divisions that separate the different Christian confessions and are anxious to find the means of overcoming them.

The consensus of the survey was based on replies from groups representing some five thousand European youth who have been studying questions relating to the Church posed in a pre-Assembly study booklet published by the World Council. The inquiry served also as a more immediate preparation for the First Ecumenical Youth Assembly in Europe which is being held at Lausanne, Switzerland, from July 13 to 24. An estimated 1,650 young people, whose average age is 21, are expected to be present for the sessions of the Assembly.

According to Pastor Michel Wagner of Paris, who is secretary of the Assembly Preparatory Committee, the survey in question revealed the following important points:

1. European youth are riding the crest of the wave of interest in church unity which has swept the Continent since the end of the war. They feel « personally responsible » for healing the Church's divisions.

2. Many do not take seriously the reasons for confessional differences. They tend to believe that unity can be achieved « almost spontaneously » if there is sufficient goodwill on all sides, without realizing the difficulties involved.

3. They are critical of their own churches for not taking more positive steps towards unity and also for their failure « to practice what they preach » in some other areas of the ministry.

4. They are more concerned than church youth of previous years have been with reaching their contemporaries outside the church and are dissatisfied and often embarrassed by the churches' failure to do so. They think too many of the youth activities of the churches are a kind of « talking to ourselves ».

The Lausanne Assembly, which will be composed of an extensive cross section of youth in various fields, is to be the first of a series of youth conferences. Other meetings of a similar kind are already planned for North America in 1961 and for Latin America in 1962. (*EPS*).

* * *

Unity to be the Theme of Catholic Liturgical Week

« The Liturgy and Unity in Christ » will be the theme of the twenty-first annual North American Liturgical Week which is to be held in Pittsburgh from August 22 to 25. The theme was chosen « in response to the call of Pope John XXIII for increased concern with the Church's unity and his plans for an ecumenical council », according to a spokesman for the national Liturgical Conference at its headquarters in Washington.

The Liturgical Week sessions will be open to both clergy and laymen, and the papers to be delivered will endeavor to show how the Church's worship manifests and achieves the Church's unity. (*NC*).

* * *

Church of Scotland to Resume Talks with Anglicans

At its June meeting in Edinburgh the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland voted to resume talks on church unity with the Anglican churches in England and Scotland. The reopening of conversations between the two communions had been suggested in the 1960 report of the Church of Scotland's Inter-Church Relations Committee published in early May.

The report stated that the time was opportune for the appointment of a committee of fifty ministers and elders, as proposed in last year's General Assembly, to prepare the ground for resumed conversations. When the issue came up for discussion at this year's Assembly, the delegates decided to approve the proposal.

It will be recalled that in Edinburgh in June 1959, the Church of Scotland rejected by a vote of 300 to 266 the scheme of « bishops in presbytery », terming it as inacceptable because it implied « a denial of the catholicity of the Church of Schotland and of the validity and regularity of its ministry within the Church Catholic ».

Conctacts, however, continued between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland despite the rejection; and a sustained correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. William Tindal, the convenor of the Church of Scotland's Inter-Church Relations Committee, rekindled hopes for eventual agreement. (*CEN*).

BOOK REVIEWS

ONE FOLD. *Essays and Documents to commemorate the Golden Jubilee of the Chair of Unity Octave,* 1908-1958. Edited by Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A. and Titus F. Cranny, S.A., Franciscan Friars of the Atonement: Graymoor, Garrison, New York, 1959, pp. 384.

The golden jubilee of the Octave of prayer for Christian unity (Chair of Unity Octave) in 1958 was an event of such importance for the Church and for all of Christendom that it well deserved to be celebrated and commemorated by an attractive volume of studies such as we have in the present work, edited by the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, spiritual sons of that great apostle of Christian unity, Fr. Paul James Francis Wattson, S. A., the originator of the Octave. In but fifty years this splendid idea has attained a remarkably fruitful development such as one could hardly have hoped for at its inception. It has, one might say, prevailed over practically all the churches, all the Christian denominations and fractions of them, which however divided they may be are at least united in prayer for a week every year in ardent supplication to the Lord that He might soon grant to Christendom the great gift of integral and visible unity.

Father Paul Wattson's entire life was consecrated to this ideal. It is most apparent from this volume that his spirit is very much alive in the congregation founded by him and is energetically at work, seeking with every effort and means to attract non-Catholics to the one fold of Christ.

This commemorative volume consists of two distinct sections: the first is concerned with the Octave itself; and the second is made up of various theological studies dealing with reunion and the return of our separated brethren.

After the preface to the book, in which the Father General of the Franciscan Friars of Atonement, the Reverend Angelus Delahunt, S. A., emphasizes the timeliness of the problem within the frame of reference constantly proposed and affirmed by Pope John XXIII, there follows an extensive series of documents, letters, and essays on various themes relating to the Octave.

Among these is an historical survey by Fr. Titus Cranny, S. A. entitled « The Chair of Unity Octave, 1908-1958 ». This is a noteworthy contribution which will undoubtedly earn the gratitude of all who read it, especially since it brings together the historical documentation regarding the origin and the development of the Octave, as well as of important data anterior to it.

How was this providential project born in the mind of Father Wattson while he was still an Episcopalian minister? At this epoch he was High-churchman, and theologically he adhered to the branch theory — a theory of the three branches into which the one Church of Christ is presumably divided: of this Father Wattson was clearly convinced between the years 1885 and 1895. But towards the year 1900 he became persuaded that Peter and Rome constitute the divinely established center of the true Church (p. 59). Thus from the first number of the *Lamp* magazine in 1903 he had acquired a clear consciousness of the decisive importance of the basic text, *Tu es Petrus* (p. 60). Subsequently in 1907, in collaboration with another Anglican, the Reverend Spencer Jones, he published a work in defense of the papacy entitled *The Prince of the Apostles* (p. 63). Towards this period, moreover, he began to relinquish the idea of *corporate reunion*, tending rather in the direction of individual conversions (p. 63). In 1908 the Unity Octave was celebrated for the first time, and the following year Father Paul and his religious community entered the fold of the Catholic Church. (On pages 70 and 71 there is reproduced a letter from Spencer Jones in which he expressly attributes to Father Wattson alone the original conception of the Octave).

As one can gather from the historical documents published in this book, the process of development was a long one and deeply meditated over in the light of decisive theological principles; it was worked out in the minutest detail, always with intense prayer and under the ardently invoked protection of Our Lady of the Atonement (p. 104). After all this one remains less surprised at Father Wattson's conversion to Catholicism than at the fact that for years he was a perfect Catholic in his own mind without having taken the decisive step. It is interesting to note that at an important point along his spiritual itinerary he was notably influenced by a book edited by Frederick George Lee, a founder of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom (A. P. U. C.), participation in which was forbidden to Catholics — a fact of which Father Wattson was at the time very likely unaware (p. 59). Worthy of note, as well, is the citation of a letter written by Father Wattson in June 1926 to the editor of *The Universe* (London) which affirmed the Graymoor founder's Catholic sensibilities

while still an Anglican: already in 1903 he had given up the « branch theory » and had professed his faith in all the teaching of the Catholic Church, including that of the Immaculate Conception and papal infallibility: « We then knew, as we know now, that there is but one holy, Catholic, apostolic, and Roman Church, and that all who do not break bread in the House of Peter are outside the One True Fold » (p. 90). This would seem to show that Father Paul was prepared by Providence for a most particular vocation — for the unity apostolate. His spiritual itinerary, therefore, seems more unique then typical. Father Wattson even nourished the desire that Pope would make the Octave a prayer of obligation for Catholics.

The spirit of the Octave is discussed by Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S. A. in the light of papal documents and against the background of Father Wattson's own experience, principally with respect to dogmatic content. As a case in point, the author treats of the above-mentioned association, the A. P. U. C. and emphasizes the danger of indifferentism which provoked its prohibition for Catholics and which underlies every such endeavor that neglects doctrinal principles; while Father Paul, from the very beginning, fixed the scope of the Octave unequivocally as being: « the return of all Christians to the Holy See » (p. 66).

In the second part of this volume the reader will find contributions from ten different authors which deal with ecclesiology and questions of unity in a manner suitable for a wide range of readers.

Fr. Francis J. Connell, C. SS. R., for example, gives a happy presentation of the essential data of what is « probably the most misunderstood doctrine of the Catholic faith » — of the necessity of the Church, of the one true Church of Christ, for the salvation of men (pp. 135-153).

Another article which merits particular mention is that of Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J. entitled « The Concept of Catholic Ecumenism » (pp. 154-166). Both substantial and clear, it sheds light on various thorny issues with a sound realism. Even with regard to the matter of praying with non-Catholics, declares Fr. Boyer, the Church must give testimony to what she really is: « She is bound to give witness of herself. She cannot perform any act nor utter any prayer by which would appear not to be what she is. She cannot ask for herself that which she already possesses by the will of Christ ... I can, indeed, pray as do Protestants, asking, like them, both for myself and for them the grace of sanctification; but I cannot, like them, ask for the unity of the Church ... When a Catholic prays for the unity of the Church, he prays that our

separated brethren accept the doctrine, the worship, and the government of the Roman Catholic Church » (p. 164).

Of the remaining essays, we cannot do less than to bring into relief one or the other more salient contributions. One of these is by Clement C. Englert, C. SS. R. who presents an historical and descriptive picture of the Catholic Eastern rites (pp. 167-182) and emphasizes their connective function, as a kind of bridge, that joins Eastern and Western Christendom.

The last two articles in *One Fold* are of a strictly theological character: the one patristic and the other speculative. In the first of these Fr. Gregory Figueroa, S. A., already known for his studies on St. Ambrose, brings together and comments on the numerous texts of this outstanding Father of the Church on the blessed Virgin Mary and the Church (pp. 259-271).

The volume then comes to a close with an important monograph by Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S. A. bearing the title « *Vestigia Ecclesiae*: Their Meaning and Value » (pp. 272-384). Theologically, this is the most noteworthy contribution to *One Fold*. It is distinguished for its clear and logical exposition and for its frequent references to the documents of the *magisterium* of the Church and to the works of converts from Protestantism; the theme is developed in a manner which is strictly rational and Thomistic. A central idea pervades the entire treatment of the author's subject and serves as the key to all his conclusions; namely, that the Church, in the precise sense of the term, is uniquely that religious society which is built on the apostle Peter and on his successors and that, consequently, the *vestigia Ecclesiae* can be verified only as the effect of this Church and can have value only in so far as they lead separated Christians towards the Church of Rome. The author is fully aware that his views will not prove to be acceptable to all who concern themselves with questions of Christian unity (p. 285), because among non-Catholics there prevails a concept of the *vestigia* which is quite diverse. Moreover, he justly deserves credit for having subjected to careful logic the many and varied aspects of a complex question. It seems to us, however, that the exposition would have gained in depth had the author given more consideration to the human and psychological aspects which inevitably enter into the heart of the question both on the natural and supernatural plane.

Father Hanahoe gives the following as a definition of the *vestigia*: « We would define the supernatural *vestigia* as contingent effects, supernatural in character, existing in the membership of a separated religious body and reflecting the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church from which their ancestors, directly or in-

directly separated » (p. 303). Naturally, the most important element here is Baptism. The author next examines the three categories of the Church's function: the ruling office, the sanctifying office, and the teaching office. He is quite right in insisting with reference to the sacraments that « these supernatural ordinances are not meant to detain the non-Catholics where they are, but to bring them back to the source of the efficacy of the Mass and of the sacraments ... » (p. 325). With regard to the teaching office, on the contrary, Father Hanahoe admits of no vestiges (p. 328); and this is the case when it is a matter of purely private judgement as well (p. 336). It is evident that the author wishes to safeguard the unicity of the Church of Peter in every respect. In conclusion he declares that if our separated brethren often take satisfaction in affirming the existence of the *vestigia ecclesiae* in their own communities, it also remains certain that the *vestigia* are not and should not be an end in themselves but are simply a sign pointing to the fullness of the Catholic Church (p. 381). In saying this the author has emphasized a most important and fundamental truth. One must, however, add that to separated Christians in good faith there is lacking the intuition and evidence how and why the *vestigia* constitute but the entrance to the Catholic spiritual edifice. It is upon this evidence that there simultaneously depend the concept of the *vestigia*, the judgement on the separated churches, and the genuine notion of the true Church of Christ they are seeking.

John Vodopivec

Oscar Cullmann, *A Message to Catholics and Protestants* (trans. by Joseph A. Burgess, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959, 57, pp., $ 1.50).

Since January, 1957, the eminent Dr. Cullmann has been earnestly urging a practical program of intercommunion charity between Catholics and Protestants. The present work is a more permanent form of his lectures and a translation of his French opuscule.

By this time Dr. Cullmann's thesis and proposal are well known. Led by his deep understanding of the nature of primitive Christianity, Cullmann sets forth the proposition, with appropriate New Testament chapter and verse, that division between Catholics and Protestants represents an offence. However, he is convinced that the union of Roman and non-Roman churches in one and the same church is impossible from a human point of view. There-

fore, in the interests of a Christian solidarity different from but similar to that of primitive Christianity, he calls for a mutual yearly offering at the time of the January prayer for Christian unity to help needy Protestants and Catholics. As an indication of what he means, Dr. Cullmann cites an experience that happened to him in Rome. After one of his lectures an anonymous Roman Catholic monk placed a banknote in his pocket with the message: « From a Catholic monk for a poor Protestant in Rome as a symbol of Christian solidarity ». He gave the money to the dean of the Waldensian seminary in Rome. The dean spoke to his students and they spontaneously took up a collection from among themselves and sent it to an abbot in Rome for someone in need.

The question that naturally comes to the minds of Catholics concerns the nature of the « solidarity » in Christ. What exactly does it mean? Charity, of course, is always in order, but Dr. Cullmann wants the charity to be between Catholics and Protestants for each other. He states specifically that the offerings must never be used as an inducement to conversion and are not to be taken as coming from one « church » for another « church ». Rather, they are to be made by Christians one for the other and are to act as the visible symbol of the « *brotherhood* of all Christians and *not* of the *unity* of the church ».

Dr. Cullmann's proposal is thus for a Catholic-Protestant life and work movement. Unfortunately but inevitably, the weakness of any such movement is that it starts out by setting aside doctrine to achieve its « practical » aim and ends up either by considering doctrine unimportant or by admitting it cannot continue without doctrine. Although Culmann strives to be absolutely fair and gives full credit to the Catholic doctrine of the nature and necessity of the Church, one suspects that he tends to look at membership in the Church as an extrinsic denomination which should not stand in the way of what is considered the more basic « solidarity ». Moreover, granted that cooperation between Catholics and Protestants in social, cultural, and even moral matters can exist for the common good in a pluralistic society, yet in has been by no means demonstrated that such deeply opposed systems of belief as Catholicism and Protestantism can produce a charity which will mutually bring about the Christian solidarity desired so ardently by Dr. Cullmann.

On the other hand, the intended effect of Cullmann's project, as he visualizes it, is to change the atmosphere of relations between Catholics and Protestants. Any alteration of existing tensions, any furthering of desire for a more amiable discussion of difficulties, any lessening of distrust, especially in the United States, would

be a welcome change indeed. Dr. Cullman, therefore, should be given a hearing in the same sincere and fair-minded spirit with which he writes.

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

G. BAUM, O. S. A., *That they may be one. A Study of Papal Doctrine.* Bloomsbury Publishing Co. London, 1958, ix + 181 pages. 21 shills.

This excellent book is a systematic exposition of the popes' teaching on the unity and disunity of Christians, as made known through their various pronouncements, beginning with those of Leo XIII and ending with those of Pius XII. It is divided into five chapters dealing with *The Unity of the Church,* the ecclesiology of the encyclicals; *Dissident Christians,* their relations as individuals to the Church; *Dissident Churches,* their relations to the Church; *Catholic Ecumenism; Its Foundation* and *Catholic Ecumenism: Its Exercise,* this last chapter having little in the way of quotation and more of logical conclusion and, incidentally, less solidity than the rest.

To me the second and third chapters are the most interesting. This quotation will give the sense of the former of these.

« After our analysis of the Christian situation of dissidents, it will not do to call them simply members of the Church *in voto.* We must be more precise. Dissident Christians are attached to the Church not in an invisible manner, like the so-called holy pagans who are justified in a hidden and almost miraculous fashion; dissidents are incorporated into the Body of Christ through the visible rite of baptism, even if their membership afterwards does not grow in the normal manner established by Christ. If the intention to belong to the Church (which is included in baptism) is not revoked by a contrary decision, there is no reason to suppose that the visible root which they have taken in the Church has been eradicated. Through their baptism then, dissident Christians are visibly related to the Catholic Church. Orthodox Christians, on the same principle, are in visible union with the Church through the whole of their sacramental life ». (p. 63).

The Churches, however, that contain such dissident individuals cannot be judged so generously; as bodies they do not belong to the true Church, though the Oriental Churches, with their true Orders and sacraments, are less removed than the others, and so could more easily be reintegrated. All the same, no Christian

should rejoice merely at a weakening of another Christian communion, for all Christian communions contain supernatural values which they share with Catholicism.

Catholic ecumenism should, so concludes the author, aim at strengthening precisely these supernatural values, for if they come to their full term they lead to union, i. e. Catholicism. It refuses to 'proselytize', for in the author's definition proselytizing is the converting from darkness to light, i. e. from paganism to Christianity; it should aim at the perfecting of the partial Christian traditions of others till they become integrated into the full Catholic faith.

These are just a few points from a book full of good things. The author apologises for his English. He need not. It is perhaps a trifle stilted — but that is his manner of thinking rather than his English — and he consistently spells dissension as dissention. All ecumenists, whether Catholic or not, should read this book, and they will draw from it much profit.

J. Gill, S. J.

* * *

NOTICE TO OUR READERS

From time to time, the Unitas Association receives requests from libraries and institutions for back numbers of its review in order to complete their collections. The numbers most frequently asked for are those from Volume I to Volume V, no. 1 inclusive and Vol. VII, no. 1. Since our reserve supply for these issues is practically exhausted, we should appreciate very much receiving any of the above numbers that our readers might care to send us.